



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



Stan Wisniewski
Director

Kerry Gottlieb
Chief Deputy

AGENDA

MARINA DEL REY DESIGN CONTROL BOARD

Thursday, May 17, 2007, 2:00 p.m.

**Burton W. Chace Park Community Building
13650 Mindanao Way ~ Marina del Rey, CA 90292**

Design Control Board Members

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Susan Cloke – Chair | - First District |
| David Abelar – Member | - Second District |
| Peter Phinney, AIA – Member | - Fourth District |
| Tony Wong, P.E. – Member | - Fifth District |
| Vacant | - Third District |

1. Call to Order, Action on Absences, Pledge of Allegiance and Order of Agenda

The Chair advises all attendees that due to time considerations, the Board may be unable to hear all the items placed on the agenda for this meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes

- January 25, 2007
- March 15, 2007

3. Design Control Board Reviews

- A. Parcel 50 – Waterside Marina del Rey - DCB #07-002-B
Approval of the record of the DCB’s March 15, 2007 action for conditional approval of ATM awning and lighting

4. Old Business

- A. Parcels 100 & 101 – Del Rey Shores – DCB #05-003-B
Further consideration of redevelopment project

5. New Business

- A. Parcel 1S – Del Rey Fuel – DCB #07-006
Consideration of redevelopment project

6. Staff Reports

- A. Temporary Permits Issued by Department
- B. Ongoing Activities Report
 - Board Actions on Items Relating to Marina del Rey
 - Local Coastal Program Periodic Review Update

- Small Craft Harbor Commission Minutes
- Marina del Rey Urban Design Guidelines Update
- Redevelopment Project Status Report
- Marina del Rey and Beach Special Events

7. Comments From The Public

Public comment within the purview of this Board (three minute time limit per speaker)

8. Adjournment

ADA ACCOMMODATIONS: If you require reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids and services such as material in alternate format or a sign language interpreter, please contact the ADA (Americans with Disability Act) Coordinator at (310) 827-0816 (Voice) or (310) 821-1734 (TDD), with at least three business days' notice.

Project Materials: All materials provided to the Design Control Board Members are available (beginning the Saturday prior to the meeting) for public review at the following Marina del Rey locations: Marina del Rey Library, 4533 Admiralty Way, 310-821-3415; Department of Beaches and Harbors Administration Building, 13837 Fiji Way, 310-305-9503; MdR Visitors & Information Center, 4701 Admiralty Way, 310-305-9546; and Burton Chace Park Community Room, 13650 Mindanao Way, 310-305-9595.

Please Note: The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted Chapter 2.160 of the Los Angeles County Code (Ord. 93-0031 §2(part), 1993) relating to lobbyists. Any person who seeks support or endorsement from the Design Control Board on any official action must certify that they are familiar with the requirements of this ordinance. A copy of this ordinance can be provided prior to the meeting and certification is to be made before or at the meeting.

Departmental Information: <http://beaches.co.la.ca.us> or <http://labeaches.info>



"To enrich lives through effective and caring service"



Stan Wisniewski
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

May 10, 2007

TO: Design Control Board
FROM: Stan Wisniewski, Director *Stan*
SUBJECT: **AGENDA ITEM 3 – DESIGN CONTROL BOARD REVIEWS:
DCB REVIEW #07-002-B**

The Design Control Board's action from March 15, 2007 is attached:

- A. Parcel 50 – Waterside Marina del Rey – DCB #07-002-B

SW:CM:CS:ks
Attachment

DRAFT

Design Control Board Review DCB #07-002-B

PARCEL NAME: Waterside Marina del Rey

PARCEL NUMBER: 50

REQUEST: Further consideration of Wells Fargo ATM (awning and lighting).

ACTION: Approved, per the submitted plans on file with the Department.

CONDITION: Lighting and alternate awning design approved.

MEETING DATE: March 15, 2007



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



May 10, 2007

Stan Wisniewski
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

TO: Marina del Rey Design Control Board

FROM: Stan Wisniewski, Director *Stan W.*

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM 4A – PARCELS 100 & 101 – DEL REY SHORES - DCB #05-003-B

Item 4A on your agenda is a returning submittal by Del Rey Shores (Applicant), seeking final design review and approval of its redevelopment proposal for the SHORES on Parcels 100 and 101. These parcels are situated between Via Marina and Via Dolce, just north of Marquesas Way, and comprise approximately 8.31 acres.

History and Brief Description of the Proposed Project

The SHORES project plan was originally considered by your Board in January 2005 (DCB #05-003, attached) and received conceptual approval at that time. The existing 202-unit, two-story, garden-style apartments in 35 buildings will be demolished and replaced with a 544-unit apartment development. As designed, there will be 12 five-story wood frame structures over two levels of subterranean and above-grade concrete parking (1,114 spaces); the proposed apartment structures are 75 feet high, with 100-foot architectural design features slicing through the buildings at the stairwells. Due to the configuration of buildings and the garage below, visitors and prospective residents will park at grade on the first level of the garage on the Via Marina side of the project or at the building entrance. Residents will use elevators or stairs to access assigned parking levels.

The project includes a 98,000 square-foot internal landscaped "courtyard" designed to provide decorative and usable open space for residents. Additionally, a 25,000 square-foot landscaped triangular courtyard on the north side of the property, adjacent to Admiralty Loop, an existing alley extending Panay Way west of Via Marina, will be included.

Architectural Design

The new residential development will consist of five stories of Type III wood frame construction over a two-level parking structure constructed of a Type I base consisting of poured-in-place concrete and masonry. The Applicant claims the development will be most visible along the west side of Via Marina, where there is approximately 700 feet of combined street frontage. The building blocks here will be staggered and offset, breaking the building mass into a series of smaller volumes. Viewed when approaching from Via Marina, the entry building at Panay Way will be followed by three similar looking buildings and a smaller accent building, echoing the entry building, at the corner of Marquesas Way.

The color scheme utilizes a marine theme with two background colors of muted neutral gray/off-white tones, punctuated by marine blue balcony trim, two tones of blue accent panel, and glass and brushed aluminum balcony rails. Metal accents in semaphore yellow are scattered through the

buildings. The lower residential floor will anchor the apartment blocks with two tones of rust red. The masonry walls of the parking levels, which serve as the podium to the apartment blocks, will be painted ochre green to anchor the buildings to the ground and form a background to the landscaping materials and berms that screen the base. A four-foot strip of light-colored block at the top of the masonry wall will include abstract waveforms in patterns of texture block. Manufacturer color numbers are called out on the second page of Elevation Views in the submittal, and Applicant will provide a materials and color board at the meeting.

The new SHORES buildings have been stepped back to the maximum setback allowed by the Fire Department to ensure compatibility with nearby condominium residences in the City of Los Angeles to the west, beyond the Del Rey Shores personal warehouses (Parcel 104, to remain). The building blocks there will repeat the articulation of the Via Marina elevations, with marine blue panels above a rust red base. The lower podium formed by the parking levels will be articulated on this side by the parking entrances and by required fire access stairs.

The marine theme of the design is evident in the sail forms throughout the project and serves as an iconic image. These sail forms are included in the stair towers within the central courtyard, the walls of the apartment units at the ends of building blocks, and segments of the roof screen.

Balconies throughout the project are expressed as a series of undulating wave shapes, alternating between concave and convex forms. The balconies are articulated with glass and metal railings. Sky bridges, located between the building blocks, connect two roof-level observation decks.

Several building access points have been distributed in and around the site to make use of existing street layout, provide circulation options for pedestrians, and minimize the impacts to the adjacent streets. Additionally, elevators and other access points have been distributed to maximize convenience.

Landscape Design

The existing site is landscaped with a variety of mature trees and shrubs that were planted over a 40-year period. All of the existing landscaping will be completely removed and replaced with new and enhanced landscaping complementary to the new contemporary buildings.

The proposed plan provides an additional 1.3 acres of open space at grade, and Applicant anticipates a substantial increase in the number of mature trees and plants, including an increase in quality. The Via Marina streetscape will feature a pattern of skyline palm trees and canopy street trees to add scale and soften the buildings. Applicant intends to include approximately 19 30-foot tall *Washingtonia* skyline palms and 21 canopy trees along the Via Marina frontage. The south side entrance area at Via Marina and Marquesas Way will be a park-like feature, defined by low water use native plants, bamboo accents and other ornamental plantings.

The 98,000 square-foot courtyard at the center of the project will be an integral part of the residential community. Landscaping here will accent several small-scale “quiet zones”, as well as centralized gathering spaces that include a pool and common area. The pool location was selected following an analysis of the sunlight exposure patterns of the site interior. The courtyard will include

plants as large as canopy trees, tree aloes, agaves and other succulents, ornamental grasses and bamboo (non-invasive) for accent and screening. Vertical accents in the courtyard will include five 30-foot Canary Island date palms mixed with Mexican Fan palms. Striking earth forms will enhance the “gardenscape” theme and serve storm-water reclamation purposes. The proposed plant palette takes into account both the need to be sensitive to water usage as well as the requirements for compliance with water runoff capture.

Flowering plant material will be used to accentuate and soften the parking entrances and garage and to enhance the streetscape for residents and visitors. An approximately 25,000 square foot triangular-shaped courtyard will provide a buffer for the units on the north side of Parcel 101 (adjacent to Archstone). This area, at Admiralty Loop, will be a planted basin that also accommodates storm-water reclamation. California Sycamores will punctuate this area, with under-plantings of ornamental grasses. Giant Timber Bamboo and seven 30-foot tall Date Palm trees will be used in the landscape area bordering the parking structure edge. Additionally, the project’s Dell Avenue side will use Giant Timber Bamboo as linear screen to further soften this edge.

Sustainability has been addressed in the design and selection of materials. Landscaping materials have been chosen to minimize water requirements, reduce heat islands and mitigate runoff. To reduce water usage, minimal lawn will be used, and only in high impact zones (courtyard areas). Accent paving and grey concrete have also been kept to a minimum to minimize heat islands. The light colors to be used in the roof, building and hardscape, the landscaping, and the overhanging balconies will contribute to the reduction of solar gain in the living units. The exterior corridors, which are broken by open stairs and landings between building blocks, help to minimize the amount of internal air-conditioned space by promoting flow-through cooling of the building masses.

Lighting Design

The lighting design and intent for the development includes a balance of technology, design, and environmental considerations to create a richly designed human environment, with careful consideration of the natural environment. Special attention has been given to comply with dark sky guidelines.

Reinforcement of pedestrian views from the corner of Via Marina and Panay Way will include a procession of small-scale poles, with a whimsical indirect lighting component mimicking the cantilevered architecture of the entry buildings. These 70-watt fixtures have an up-lighting component, but are shielded so that the light is directed back to the ground, with a very soft, pleasing quality of light. The procession of poles will define the main entry walkway, passing under the entry building and guiding the eye to the lush landscape inside the courtyard. Additionally, column-mounted 70-watt indirect lighting, also following the pathway under the building, will create a warm, inviting place to gather in the open areas of the patio.

The pedestrian poles surrounding the pool utilize a different style of head, with optical controls to ensure that the 42-watt lighting will be directed to the ground, not into the sky or residences. The large row of trees that accent the transition between the spaces within the central courtyard and the

surrounding decks will be up-lit, using efficient 70-watt light sources with precision optics and glare control to assure that the light is directed up onto the trees, and not into the night sky or residences.

The large sail-like structures in the courtyard will be lit from below with high performance, 70-watt cool-to-the-touch, in-grade fixtures. These fixtures graze the entire height of the structure, with careful beam control to minimize stray light. Inside the open stairways, compact fluorescent 26-watt ceiling lights will illuminate the stairs. The stair transitions at grade level will be lit with a series of compact 18-watt fluorescent steplights, isolating light where it's needed to navigate the steps. In less-trafficked areas, full cutoff compact fluorescent wall sconces will light the pathways.

Signage

The SHORES development will bring to the Marina new architecture, a new "look" and identity for the project, and cutting edge graphics and signage designed to complement the architecture and be in harmony with the overall Marina theme. The new identity developed for the project includes the rich nautical colors being used in the architecture and a strong wave and sail theme. Signage and graphics for the project will be fabricated of stainless steel and glass, and will expand on the nautical theme with the use of light, airy signage. A new logo and type will be used on all signage and collateral graphics to unite the project and create a "sense of place" for residents that says "21st Century Marina del Rey".

The main identification signage at the corner of Via Marina and Admiralty Loop (Sign 1-1) and at the corner of Via Marina and Marquesas Way (Sign 2-1) will be crafted with individual stainless steel letters floating on stainless steel waves, reminiscent of a perfect Pacific Ocean day. Information panels on these signs will be translucent glass, designed to resemble billowing sails. Illumination of these panels will be subtle, with soft "halo" illumination of individual letters so that the message will seem to float at night. The landscape architect will oversee the entry signage design to ensure a seamless blend of natural materials and graphics; the signage will be integrated into the master landscape plan and will appear to be rising from a sea of green foliage.

The point of entry directional sign into the main driveway (Sign 7-1) will be sail-like in lightness and sparkle, and the materials will match the main identification signage. The building ID signage (Sign 3-1) facing Via Marina will be mounted hanging from a ceiling/roof overhang.

Parking entry signage into the residents' garages (Sign 5-1) and visitor garage (Sign 4-1) will be wall mounted low-key individual stainless steel letters over the entrances, non-illuminated so as not to disturb the neighbors.

The overall signage master plan has a strong sculptural quality of individual letters that seem to float without backgrounds so as not to block views or create barriers. Marine quality stainless steel, glass, and nautical accent colors and landscaping will establish the SHORES.

Staff Review

This returning submittal is in response to DCB Review #05-003, which granted conceptual approval of redevelopment. The project design is geared to being inviting to the public with several

courtyards, shade trees, extensive landscaping and pleasant lighting. The information and plans addressing these final design components are in conformance with the *Specifications and Minimum Standards of Architectural Treatment and Construction*.

Architectural Design

The Applicant has incorporated various Marina influences in its design and color palette, as well as in its landscape design. Various structural components reflect waves or sails. Angled placement and various design features have been used to break-up the rectilinear nature of structures. The entrance building provides public views into a portion of the landscaped courtyard of the complex. The angled setbacks and various design features consider the public perception of pedestrians.

Open Space and Landscape Design

With only 12 buildings on the new site, significantly less parcel area will be covered by structures. The Applicant is providing a significant amount of on-site open space, both in a very large internal landscaped courtyard and a triangular planting area on the exterior, as well as landscaped setbacks. The Applicant has provided for a landscaped courtyard that will provide both quiet areas and social gathering places. Applicant is providing mature specimen trees and tall palm trees to contrast with the structures.

Parcels 100 and 101 do not have water frontage. Thus, there are no requirements for providing a public waterfront promenade and related amenities or for providing view corridors on these parcels.

Signage

The proposed signage is in conformance with the *Revised Permanent Sign Controls and Regulations*. In addition, Applicant has been granted a Variance on the signage requirements by the Department of Regional Planning. Signage will require further approval from the Department of Regional Planning.

The Department recommends APPROVAL of DCB #05-003-B, with the condition that the Applicant obtain further signage approval from the Department of Regional Planning.



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



Design Control Board Review DCB #05-003

Stan Wisniewski
Director

Kerry Gottlieb
Chief Deputy

PARCEL NAME: Del Rey Shores

PARCEL NUMBER: 100S and 101S

REQUEST: Consideration of redevelopment, including the demolition of the existing 202 apartment units and construction of 544 new apartment units.

ACTION: Conceptual approval.

CONDITIONS: Post entitlement -- the applicant must return to the Board and address the following issues:

- Design a landscape that echoes both the playfulness and sophistication of the architecture;
- Use water thematically;
- Create a plant palette of native plants and continue to include architectural shapes and elements;
- Examine all of the street edges, create parkway and canopy trees;
- Examine the possibility of a fitness trail and/or any other public amenities as appropriate;
- Review and research all materials and alternatives, looking at sustaining the crispness of the color palette;
- Look at the materials in terms of solar gain and wind loads;
- Examine issues of sustainability of building materials and landscape;
- Maximize opportunities for stormwater capture and groundwater infiltration;
- Look at the design of the garages for circulation and for access and egress to make sure it works for the size of the project and the number of tenants;
- Lighting plan that is subtle and sufficient for safety and that does not interfere with the night sky;
- Consider tenants and neighbors; and
- Wonderful opportunity to create a park, ensure that there are comfortable places within and without.

The applicant must also return with materials, colors fenestration, landscape, signage and all the issues that are typically addressed by the Board.

MEETING DATE: January 20, 2005



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



Stan Wisniewski
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

May 10, 2007

TO: Marina del Rey Design Control Board
FROM: Stan Wisniewski, Director *Stan*

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM 5A – PARCEL 1S – DEL REY FUEL - DCB #07-006

Overview

Del Rey Fuel, LLC (Applicant) has applied for conceptual approval of its plans for the redevelopment of the Fuel Dock facility at Parcel 1S. The subject property is located at the east terminus of Bora Bora Way and is surrounded by Parcel 112, which contains a large multi-family residential complex.

Project Description

The proposed redevelopment of the Fuel Dock facility will entail the removal of all existing docks, buildings and other improvements at the site, with the exception of the existing underground fuel storage tanks and 16 existing piles that moor the outer fuel dock.

The proposed project will replace the existing outer fuel dock in the same location and will provide for the installation of a new fuel delivery system. Development will consist primarily of new docks, a new fuel delivery system, pump-out stations, bait pens, a catch weigh station, a waterside retail kiosk, landside marine commercial space, new hardscape, and new landscaping.

Waterside Development

There are currently no slips at the site; boats side-tie to existing docks only. The waterside portion of the project will entail the complete replacement of all docks with new docks made of concrete capable of mooring 1,087 lineal feet of boats, ranging from small dinghies to yachts 200 feet in length. There will be five slips for boats between 53 and 65 feet and three slips capable of docking boats from 125 to 200 feet. The primary design consideration is to maintain the project's inherent flexibility to accommodate a wide range of boat sizes.

In addition, the waterside improvements will include a water taxi landing area, two pump-out stations, bait pens, a fish weigh station and a retail kiosk on the outer fuel dock. The existing single-story 450-square foot office structure built on piles over the water and the existing 200-square foot sales office currently located on the main fuel dock will be removed, and a new 1,900-square foot retail and sales kiosk will be located on the outer dock to replace these. This kiosk will act as the single point of customer contact for fuel and bait sales and provide boater convenience items, food for off-site consumption and other items similar to a small convenience store.

The new waterside structure will be constructed over engineered floating dock assemblies with

electricity and water provided from shore. The building shall be constructed of wood with wood siding and an angular and butterfly roof 19 feet high. The design incorporates a wavelike articulation of a suspended canopy, providing a soothing, playful design reminiscent of Cannery Row. The canopy will also provide shaded seating to patrons. Fuel pumps will be similar in design to ordinary automotive station equipment, except with internal hose reels. Security gates will separate public traffic areas from sensitive fueling areas and provide security to slip tenants. The public water taxi will be provided a mooring area for the drop-off and pick-up of passengers at the fuel dock, and public shopping in the kiosk will be encouraged. The color palette selected will include light grays and blues along with a red canopy edge, as indicated on the submittal color chips.

New state-of-the-art high-speed pumps and fire suppression systems will provide efficient and safe fueling to all vessels. The new pumps will be capable of delivering up to 60 gallons per minute for four different fuel types. There will be an automatic payment system for large volume customers, housing of related emergency and safety equipment as required by applicable laws, and a state-of-the-art fuel spill containment system with on-site supervisory staff present at all times the fuel dock is open for business.

Landside Development

The landside portion of the project will entail complete redevelopment as well. The existing single-story 947-square foot building will be replaced with a new 1,400-square foot building containing public restrooms and boater showers, dry storage for transient boater use, marine commercial space (that may include over-the-counter food service), an inventory storage area, and housing for related emergency and safety equipment.

Existing underground fuel storage tanks (replaced in 1996) will be retained. Tanks and related piping will be constantly monitored by an electronic system capable of detecting potential malfunctions. In the unlikely event of a problem at the fuel dock, all pumps and fuel delivery hoses will automatically shut off and an alarm will sound.

The design of the landside building shall follow the same design and color scheme as the waterside building. Access to the docks will be provided by four gangways, one along the Basin A boundary (ADA compliant) and three along the Main Channel boundary. The area surrounding the building will provide for a common gathering area, which may be used for fishing tournaments, outdoor dining, or as a place for viewing the fuel dock operations and related boating activity.

Hardscape

New hardscape matching the existing waterfront promenade recently completed at the adjacent parcel will be added across this property. Identical paving designs, railings, lighting, seating, and landscaping shall be utilized in order to assure conformity with the existing promenade. There will be two 20-foot by 10-foot over-the-water view platforms at the top of each Main Channel gangway, totaling approximately 400 square feet. Additionally, 13 on-site surface parking spaces (an increase of eight from the existing five spaces) will be provided. Parking will be primarily for employees and slip tenants.

Lighting

Facility hours of operation are from 7am to 7pm in the summer and from 7am to 5pm in the winter, after which time lighting for the project will conform to the dark sky initiatives of Marina del Rey. Lighting on the promenade shall be identical to the existing lighting on Parcel 112, and lighting on the docks will be functional downlighting necessary for docking and safe fueling operations. Except for security lighting and for special events such as fishing tournaments, lighting will be turned off after the hours of operation. Signage-related lighting shall be proposed at a later date.

Signage and Landscaping

Lessee shall return at a later date with final signage and landscaping plans.

STAFF REVIEW

Development Rights and Regulations

The LCP shows Parcel 1S as zoned Marine Commercial in Development Zone (DZ) 1, the Bora Bora Development Zone. The subject DZ 1 currently has an available development allocation of 10,000 square feet of retail space and 26,000 square feet of office space. The established parcel height limit is 25 feet, which neither proposed structure will exceed.

Land Use Context

Parcel 1S is located at the eastern terminus of Bora Bora Way, adjacent to the Main Channel at the southeast corner of Basin A. The property is bounded on the south and west by Parcel 112 (zoned Residential and Water Overlay), on the north by Basin A and on the east by the Main Channel.

Environmental Review Process

Applicant has not yet filed an application with the Department of Regional Planning (DRP) to initiate the environmental review process under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the proposed project scope. Following your Board's action on this item, Applicant will file the project at DRP, where a full project review, including an environmental analysis, will be completed prior to consideration by the Regional Planning Commission.

Lease Compliance

The Department is reviewing the project for consistency with the Board of Supervisors' approved lease option/lease. Should this consistency review require a project design modification that is material, the Department will schedule this project for reconsideration by your Board.

The Department recommends Approval of DCB #07-006 with the following condition:

Design Control Board
May 10, 2007
Item 5A
Page 4

Any material project design changes made for consistency with lease provisions shall require further DCB review before continuing through the entitlement process. For post-entitlement DCB review, Applicant will provide full project design details for the buildings, promenade, landscaping, signage, and lighting.

SW:CM:CS:ks



"To enrich lives through effective and caring service"



Stan Wisniewski
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

May 10, 2007

TO: Design Control Board
FROM: Stan Wisniewski, Director *Stan*
SUBJECT: **AGENDA ITEM 6A - TEMPORARY PERMITS ISSUED BY DEPARTMENT**

Item 6A on your agenda provides us an opportunity to advise your Board of permits issued by the Department for temporary banners, signs and tents. Since our last report, the Department issued the following:

TP #07-002-Ext - Extension of temporary permit for seven banners announcing the 2007 Halibut Derby. The banners were placed at various locations at Chace Park, the Public Launch Ramp, Marina Fuels and Shanghai Red's. The banners were permitted from March 22, 2007 through April 23, 2007.

Additional information is provided in the attachment.

SW:CM:CS:ks
Attachment



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



March 19, 2007

Stan Wisniewski
Director

Kerry Gottlieb
Chief Deputy

Mr. Paul Simon
Halibut Derby Committee
c/o Marina del Rey Anglers
4230 Del Rey Avenue #530
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

**HALIBUT DERBY TEMPORARY BANNERS
(TP 07-002-Ext)**

Dear Mr. Simon:

By means of this letter and the appropriate letters of concurrence (received from Del Rey Fuels, Pacific Ocean Management and Shanghai Red's), the Marina del Rey Anglers are permitted to place seven (7) banners at the following locations for the 2007 Halibut Derby to be held on April 21st and 22nd:

- One 3-foot by 5-foot banner on the chain link fence facing Basin H at Dock 52 (P-52);
- One 3-foot by 5-foot banner on the pole framework above the bait tanks at Marina Fuels Dock (P-1);
- One 3-foot by 5-foot banner on the chain link fence at the south side of the public launch ramp (P-49), facing the ramps;
- One 3-foot by 5-foot banner on the chain link fence at the north side of the public launch ramp (P-49), facing the ramps;
- One 3-foot by 5-foot banner on the metal chain link fence in front of Shanghai Red's (P-61), facing the main channel;
- One 3-foot by 5-foot banner on the chain link fence in the southwest corner of Burton Chace Park (P-EE), facing Basin H; and
- One 4-foot by 20-foot banner on the second floor balcony of the Boat House (P-48), facing Basin H.

Halibut Derby Temporary Banner
February 21, 2007
Page 2 of 2

The 3-foot by 5-foot banners will be made of yellow plastic with blue logo and lettering. The 4-foot by 20-foot banners will be made of yellow plastic with blue logo and lettering. The original permit allowed the banners through March 22, 2007. This extension permits the banners through April 23, 2007. The banners must be removed by noon on April 24, 2007. Failure to remove the banners by this time will result in their removal and storage by the County of Los Angeles at your expense. Should you have any further questions or requests, please contact Chris Sellers, at 310-578-6448.

Very truly yours,

STAN WISNIEWSKI, DIRECTOR



Charlotte Miyamoto, Chief
Planning Division

SW:CM:CS
cc: Wayne Schumaker
Steve Green
Michael Kerzie
Mark Spiro
Lynn Atkinson
Jose Mata



To enrich lives through effective and caring service

May 10, 2007



Stan Wisniewski
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

TO: Design Control Board

FROM: Stan Wisniewski, Director

Stan W.

SUBJECT: **AGENDA ITEM 6B - ONGOING ACTIVITIES REPORT**

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTIONS ON ITEMS RELATING TO MARINA DEL REY

At its May 1, 2007 meeting, the Board held a hearing on adoption of an affordable housing policy for Marina del Rey. The Board continued the hearing to May 15 and instructed County staff to prepare and submit a financial analysis of various options and scenarios for moderate and low income housing in the Marina.

At its March 27, 2007 meeting, the Board held a hearing on an amendment to the Marina del Rey Local Coastal Program (LCP), the purpose of which is to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Design Control Board (DCB) and the timing of the DCB's review of Marina redevelopment projects during the coastal development permit process. The Board approved an amendment that clarifies it is the role of the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) to determine project consistency with the LCP, whereas it is the DCB's role to initially conceptually review a project's architectural design and site planning. The amendment further allows coastal development permit applications to be filed with the RPC prior to the DCB's conceptual review of the project, with the DCB having up to 120 days after the filing of the application to submit its recommendations to the RPC. Further, after the RPC's action on the coastal development permit, the DCB will have final review of project architectural design, landscaping and signs.

At its April 17 meeting, the Board approved a one-year contract, with four one-year extension options, with Aquatic Bioassay and Consulting Laboratories, Inc. for marine environment monitoring and analysis services within the Marina harbor.

LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM PERIODIC REVIEW – UPDATE

Coastal Commission staff has advised they intend to schedule consideration of their Marina del Rey Local Coastal Program periodic review revised staff report at the Commission's July 2007 meeting in San Luis Obispo. Coastal and County staffs have scheduled a meeting for May 30 to discuss the revised report and areas of agreement or ongoing disagreement.

SMALL CRAFT HARBOR COMMISSION MINUTES

The minutes from the March 14, 2007 meeting are attached.

MARINA DEL REY URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES UPDATE

A meeting was held at the end of last month with Keith Gurnee of RRM Design Group, the consultant selected to develop Marina Design Guidelines. He provided his critique of the Design Guidelines previously prepared by another consultant to the Department, as well as questions for consideration as his critique is reviewed. Chair Susan Cloke and Member Peter Phinney are reviewing the critique and the questions, and their comments are expected shortly.

REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Attached is a copy of the project status report providing details and the current status of projects in the redevelopment process in the Marina. Copies of this report are also available at the Lloyd Taber-Marina del Rey Public Library and on the Department's web site (marinadelrey.lacounty.gov).

MARINA DEL REY AND BEACH SPECIAL EVENTS

MARINA DEL REY

MARINA DEL REY OUTDOOR ADVENTURES

Sponsored by the Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors
Burton Chace Park ♦ 13650 Mindanao Way ♦ Marina del Rey ♦ CA ♦ 90292

Bird Watching Experience Program

Thursday, June 28 at 9:00 am

Thursday, May 24 at 4:00 pm

County-sponsored bird watching walk for adults is a free two-hour walk, which will take place at various sites in the Ballona Wetlands. Meeting will take place at the Burton Chace Park Community Room. Participation, parking and transportation to tour site are free. Pre-registration is a must!

Harbor Kayaking Program

Saturdays

May 26, June 16, July 28, August 25, September*, October 27 and November 10

11:30 am – 1:45 pm

*September date yet to be determined

Come and take a kayaking lesson in Marina del Rey harbor. This two-hour session begins with Los Angeles County Lifeguard instruction and water safety. The group will get the opportunity

to enjoy Marina del Rey's basins. This is a great opportunity for families to have a fun and educational day in Marina del Rey. Program requires pre-registration. Fees are \$25 (youths 10 – 18) and \$30 (19 or older). Fees must be paid upon registering.

Surf Kayaking Program

Saturdays

May 26, June 16, July 28, August 25, September*, October 27 and November 10

8:00 – 11:00 am

*September date yet to be determined

Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors is offering a Surf Kayaking Program. Participants will get the opportunity to kayak through Marina del Rey Harbor and head out to the North Jetty, where they will surf the waves aboard sit-on-top kayaks. Los Angeles County Ocean Lifeguards will instruct the outing. Program requires pre-registration. Fees are \$25 (youths 10 – 18) and \$30 (19 or older). Fees must be paid upon registering.

For all Outdoor Adventures Programs call: **Burton Chace Park at (310) 822-8530.**

FISHERMAN'S VILLAGE WEEKEND CONCERT SERIES

Sponsored by Pacific Ocean Management, LLC

All concerts from 2:00 pm - 5:00 pm

Saturday, May 12

Uncle Monkey, playing Tropical Rock

Sunday, May 13

Upstream, playing Caribbean Sounds

Saturday, May 19

Chris Mulkey, playing Blues

Sunday, May 20

Chris "Hammer" Smith Band, playing Harmonica Jazz & Blues

Saturday, May 26

LA Bluescaster, playing Blues

Sunday, May 27

Son Candela, playing Latin Jazz

For more information call: Pacific Ocean Management at (310) 822-6866.

BEACH EVENTS

FIESTA HERMOSA

Hermosa Beach Chamber of Commerce
Pier Avenue at the Strand
May 26th through May 28th
10:00 am to 6:00 pm

Arts and crafts from throughout the West will be featured at the Hermosa Beach Chamber of Commerce Memorial Day Fiesta weekend from 10:00 am to 6:00 pm on all three days. Admission is free. The family-oriented festival will also feature kiddie rides (for a minimal fee), a restaurant cantina, two sound stages, and a beer and wine garden. Parking in town is limited, thus visitors are encouraged to park at the Northrop Grumman R-5 parking lot at Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Doolittle Street. A free shuttle bus will run continuously from 7:30 am to 7:30 pm from the lot to Pier Avenue. Parking is also available at Mira Costa High School at 701 S. Peck Ave. with Shuttle Wave buses providing free shuttle service to and from the Fiesta.

For more information call: Hermosa Beach Chamber of Commerce at (310) 376-0951 or visit the event website at www.fiestahermosa.com.

MUSCLE BEACH INTERNATIONAL CLASSIC BODYBUILDING & FIGURE CONTEST

City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
Venice Beach/Muscle Beach
Pre-judging, Sunday, May 27th at 10:00 am
Finals, Monday, May 28th at 12:00 noon
1800 Ocean Front Walk

Los Angeles City Department of Recreation & Parks will host its annual bodybuilding competition at Venice Beach, May 27th and May 28th. Event is free and open to the public.

For more information call: Department of Recreation and Parks at (310) 399-2775.

SW:CM:ks
Attachments (2)

**SMALL CRAFT HARBOR COMMISSION
MINUTES
MARCH 14, 2007**

Commissioners

Searcy Harley, Chairman; Russ Lesser, Vice-Chairman; Albert Landini, Ed.D. Christopher Chuang-I Lin, Ph.D.; Vanessa Delgado, MPA

Department of Beaches and Harbors

Stan Wisniewski, Director

Also Present

Thomas Faughnan, Principal Deputy County Counsel; Beverly Moore, MdR Convention and Visitors Bureau; Captain Mary Campbell, Sheriff's Department; Sgt. Michael Carriles, Sheriff's Department; Deputy John Rochford, Sheriff's Department

1. CALL TO ORDER, ACTION ON ABSENCES AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Searcy called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. The Commissioners, staff and members of the public stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Searcy moved and Commissioner Delgado second a motion to approve and discuss the February 14, 2007 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

CHAIRMAN SEARCY OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Nancy Marino stated there were errors to her comments from the February 14, 2007 minutes. She stated her public comment on Page 2 should read, "alternate forms of transportation such as the waterbus and shuttle only run from Memorial Day to Labor Day. On Page 3 should read, "200 people were at the prior DCB meeting but were not given adequate time for discussion" and on Page 5 which states, "The lessees want and believe what will streamline the approvals process....of the MdR's Master Plan. The Lessees feel...participation and review." Ms. Marino said wanted these comments removed and replaced with, "it is the County's obligation verses the Lessees to bring the Master Plan to public attention to allow public participation and review." She stated she was not speaking for Lessees, but was speaking on behalf of many groups who have expressed the idea that they would like to know what is going on because they don't think there was a Master Plan.

Mr. Doug Ring faxed documentation to correct an error from the February 14, 2007 minutes. On page two, paragraph four which says, "He stated any liveaboard tenant of his could apply for a slip, but there is guarantee." Mr. Ring wrote that it should read, "He stated any liveaboard tenant of his could apply for a slip, but there is no guarantee."

Chairman Searcy moved and Commissioner Delgado second a motion to approve the corrections for the February 14, 2007 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. REGULAR REPORTS

a. Marina Sheriff – Crime Statistics

Sgt. Carriles stated vehicle and bicycle thefts have decreased since arrests have been made. There have been no boat burglaries or boat thefts. He stated thefts from vehicles are not occurring from break-ins, but from items in plain view and has informed Lessees and apartment managers to notify their tenants.

--- Enforcement of Seaworthy & Liveaboard Sections of the Harbor Ordinance

Sgt. Rochford stated there were fifteen liveaboard permits issued in February. No notices to comply were issued, but would be posted at the end of March. The total reported docked vessels are 4,416 and 7.7%-registered vessels.

CHAIRMAN SEARCY OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Carla Andrus apologized because she was unable to review this information and would like it discussed at the next meeting. She stated when the numbers are reviewed it would prove that tenants with smaller boats are being evicted and that new liveaboards have larger boats. She commented that if this were reviewed closely it would show how smaller boats are being displaced and evicted.

b. Marina del Rey and Beach Special Events

Mr. Wisniewski discussed the upcoming events in MdR, which was submitted and discussed at the meeting.

c. Marina del Rey Convention and Visitors Bureau

Ms. Beverly Moore reported that the MdR Convention and Visitors Bureau publishes quarterly the Hospitality News for Travel and Trade, which focuses toward group and meeting planners. She said the Bureau has added tripadvisor.com, wikitravel.com and world66.com to the website to inform residents and visitors about activities occurring in the Marina and that it is monitored regularly for compliance. She commented that during the last several years, bus service has decreased in MdR. The Culver City, Santa Monica and MTA bus lines have substantial routing and scheduling problems. She stated the Culver City bus services Fisherman's Village, only travels two blocks in the Marina, doesn't operate on Sundays and doesn't connect from Fisherman's Village to Mother's Beach. She stated riders would have to switch to the Blue Bus, which comes every hour and ends at Venice Pier. She commented that this shows a lack of coordination between the three bus lines and that a group was formed to discuss and identify these problems for improved bus services.

4. OLD BUSINESS

a. Panay Way Marina Boat Slip Eviction of Ruben Cardona

Mr. Sherman Gardner commented that the word eviction was an incorrect term to use in this particular case and that it is not in their nature to evict any one or send anyone away. He explained that they have been in business for a very long time and only evicted few people if any at all. He stated in this particular case they were rehabbing the Marina in phases, which took approximately twelve months. During the process, Mr. Cardona informed them that he was relocating to King Harbor, where he is a member. Mr. Gardner stated staff bent over backwards to find Mr. Cardona a slip and extended the period of time in which he was staying elsewhere. He stated he was not aware that Mr. Cardona was evicted and it was not because of rehabbing the Marina they don't do that. Notices are sent out to tenants informing them of the plan for those who are in good standing and have been good residents for a long period of time.

CHAIRMAN SEARCY OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Donald Klein explained that he was a tenant at Dolphin Marina in the past and received an eviction notice, as well as others. He asked Dockmaster Ispas why he was being evicted and was told that he didn't have to give him a reason. He stated he would like to see that all of Mr. Gardner's statements be verified. This would show that there were quite a few evictions.

Ms. Carla Andrus commented that past minutes should be reviewed because this is an ongoing process. She stated Mr. Cardona wanted to stay in the Marina to be near his mother, place of employment and was not a member of King Harbor but had no other options. He contacted POWER because he felt his eviction was unfair and does not know what this is about. Because he had no rent issues and was a good tenant and neighbor. She commented that she was glad to hear he was not being welcomed back due to violations.

Ms. Nancy Marino stated at the February 14, 2007 meeting Commissioners requested for the Lessee to return because they had intimated that Mr. Cardona had been evicted for cause. She commented that the statement made sounded like a bald face lie and does not think both statements could be true.

Commissioner Landini stated that Mr. Gardner did not say why he did not or was not inviting Mr. Cardona back and that a statement should be submitted.

Commissioner Lesser and Commissioner Landini asked Mr. Gardner if Mr. Cardona wanted to return now would he be welcomed back.

Mr. Gardner stated anyone is welcomed to apply. He is more than welcomed to submit an application, but he doesn't have all the details as to why Mr. Cardona was not asked to return.

Commissioner Lesser stated the Commission wants details and if he applied would there be any reason he would not be accepted assuming there is space.

Mr. Gardner stated that he would be happy to have the Dockmaster submit his itinerary as to what took place in the Marina to the Commission.

Chairman Searcy asked that the Dockmaster come forward to explain with more details.

Mr. Horia Ispas, Dockmaster for Panay Way Marina Harbor stated he would be happy to submit in writing the whole itinerary, including issues relating to Mr. Cardona's tenancy to notices that were served. He stated he would have this information within a week.

Chairman Searcy commented that this information would be shared with the public and requested that he attend the next meeting with or without Mr. Gardner and if Mr. Cardona is available to attend as well.

b. Liveaboard Bill of Rights Review By County Counsel

Chairman Searcy approved to continue this item at the April 11, 2007 meeting at the request of Mr. Jun Yang representative of POWER.

5. NEW BUSINESS**a. Appointment of a Member and Alternate to the Marina del Rey Convention and Visitors Bureau Board of Directors for 2007**

Chairman Searcy moved and Commissioner Delgado second a motion to appoint Commissioner Landini as Alternate Member Board of Directors and Commissioner Lesser as Member to the MdR Convention and Visitors Bureau Board of Directors for 2007. The motion passed unanimously.

b. Traffic Mitigation Measures Within Marina del Rey – Quarterly Report

Mr. Barry Kurtz discussed the completed, proposed and under construction transportation projects in MdR. He stated the Board approved the MdR Summer Shuttle Pilot Program in partnership with Playa Vista for expansion in 2007. The Traffic Mitigation Measures Within MdR Report and Summer Shuttle Pilot Program was submitted and discussed at the meeting.

Commission Landini stated he was pleased with the clarity of the report and maps and suggested the Argonaut publish this for the public's view. He asked for an overview of Proposed Project Item One.

Mr. Kurtz stated the project completion date is scheduled for 2007 and has been submitted by Public Works for the 2007 call for projects. If approved for funding the designing process will start and if not Public Works will look for other funding alternatives or it will be postponed. The EIR/EIS process will continue, but Project 2 and 4 were not submitted in the call for projects.

Commissioner Delgado asked if these improvements were related to projects or the master plan or is this specific to proposals from Public Works.

Mr. Kurtz stated that Proposed Project Item 1 was envisioned to improve circulation in the Marina. It was considered a Regional Transportation Improvement that would mitigate development that has already occurred in the City and County of Los Angeles, which 98% of the developments has occurred in Los Angeles and Culver City. He stated Item 2 was a LCP requirement that Admiralty Way be improved to handle the traffic generated by redevelopment in the Marina and development in the adjacent jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles. Lastly, he stated Item 3 was also in the LCP, which would mitigate more development in the City of Los Angeles than in the Marina because this route is used by bike path traffic.

CHAIRMAN SEARCY OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Nancy Marino stated Item 5 of the Proposed Transportation Improvements is being done without public notice or hearings. She stated she received information that it was a mitigation measure for the Del Rey Shores Project and that the public has adequate time for input on this project. She disagreed because residents who live 100 feet from Parcels of Del Rey Shores only noticed it. She stated she and other residents did not receive notice regarding this project and did not know this type of mitigation was being offered for this project. On Item 8 she commented that it might be a good idea to widen the lanes, alternate transportation for efficiency, paint the waterside bike lane on Admiralty Way and included that a bike lane is needed in the residential area of Via Marina, because it is dangerous. She said Item 16 states the LCP requires an internal MdR Shuttle System and thinks this program is inadequate and does not take into account the huge residential population that already exists or planned for some of the larger developments that are going into MdR.

Ms. Helen Garrett stated a Shuttle System is needed in MdR because older people are losing their ability to drive and without transportation are forced to move. She commented that there are discussions relating to new apartment structures being built to improve and mitigate traffic, but there is no discussion about mitigating the lives of people. She asked the Commission to consider a shuttle system, which they are entitled to and want.

Mr. Kurtz commented on statements given by Ms. Marino. He said the Palawan Way/Washington Street Proposed Improvement traffic signal was mentioned in the EIR with other projects that needed mitigation for developments such as Del Rey Shores and Admiralty Apartments. He stated that on the Fiji Way Bike Lane Project only one side of the street is wide enough to ride a bike lane and that is why Fiji Way is being widened and if a bike lane is only on one side it will encourage people to ride the wrong way. He explained that a shuttle is wanted and needed in MdR and has been worked on for years. There was a shuttle operated by LADOT that failed due to lack of riders, but wasn't operated throughout MdR. In the past, meetings were formed with MTA and Public Works Transit to discuss a shuttle service. It was agreed not feasible due to the demand for riders during peak hours, which was not there. In 2003 and 2007, MTA again denied funding.

Commissioner Lesser commented that most beaches have dial-a-rides and are cost effective. Shuttle systems allow people to get around who are unable to drive, but it seems that there is no demand with a population this size to justify a Shuttle system.

Mr. Kurtz agreed a Shuttle is needed. He said a meeting was held with Playa Vista to set up a demand responsive system to serve MdR, Fox Hills, Howard Hughes Center and LMU. It is scheduled to open in 2010, will be free during peak hours and considered a requirement for Playa Vista Development by the City and County of Los Angeles to have an expanded shuttle. The County would like to piggyback on that shuttle and have it full time through the Marina and will not be satisfied with the demand responsive system. He stated the problem with a ten minute fixed route is driving around MdR and to have enough buses to do that it cost approximately \$500,000 a year, which is not the initial main cost. The main cost is the ongoing maintenance to pay bus drivers and a steady source of income. He stated Playa Vista is paying this with their monthly residence fees and an ongoing source of funds is needed that would serve a fixed route Shuttle system through MdR.

Chairman Searcy stated this was an issue and suggested that each Commissioner discuss this with their appointing authorities and to watch it closely.

Mr. Wisniewski stated the Department is committed to the dial a ride or internal Shuttle system with surrounding neighborhoods.

Commissioner Lin said people tend to focus primarily on expanding freeways instead of the public system. This is a County Wide problem and our mentality needs to change and use public transportation to help mitigate traffic.

c. Approval of Option for Lease to Facilitate Redevelopment – Parcels 52R & GG (Boat Central) – Marina del Rey

Mr. Wisniewski stated that the Department has completed a RFP Process for Parcels 52R & GG. Parcel 52R is currently a public parking lot used frequently for guest of fishing and charter vessels. Parking will be in the new Fisherman's Village project. Parcel GG consist of the Sherriff's boat ride facility, a black and white auto repair facility, five office trailers for staff, boat slips used by DBH and the Sheriff's Dept. The proposal is to replace or move these facilities offsite. The Sheriff's boat ride facility will remain onsite as well as the boat slips for DBH. It would be replaced with a Dry Stack Storage Facility that will be approximately 47,000 sq. ft., 70 ft. high and will extend out partially over the water 97 ft. on the Westside and 45 ft. on the Eastside of the facility. It will accommodate between 346-367 dry storage boats and 28 boat trailers. There will be outside storage for 30 Mast-Up sailboats and no less than 131 on-site parking spaces.

He stated the intent is to move the facilities that currently exist on Parcel 77, which is adjacent to Chace Park. The Departments option is to purchase in order to expand Burton Chace Park.

There will be sufficient storage capacity in this new project to meet the needs of those that are at Parcel 77. There is a boat repair facility on Parcel 77 and there will be a new boat repair operation at the new project. He stated there would not be a net loss for the boat repair facility. It was important to maintain the small boat repair facility because commercial boat repair yards have higher overhead and are costly. He stated the estimated balance received from Parcel 52 is approximately \$24,000 a year and \$0 from Parcel GG. The \$24,000 will increase to approximately \$340,000 a year in County rent. The Dry Storage Facility will require a LCP Amendment to move and facilitate the construction and believes that at Parcel 52/GG there is currently a designation for a public building and intends this to be DBH Administration Building, but will continue to look at other sites in MdR. Does not want to relocate there, because it is an ideal site for Dry Stack Storage. It is in a commercial area, next to two boat repair yards, next to our Departments launch ramp and is a boater friendly environment.

Mr. Wisniewski stated he thinks this is the only place in MdR a facility of this type could be. It would be a new 60-year lease, which would incorporate the Departments Fair Market Value provisions. The Department has an appraisal that confirms that the deal negotiated represents Fair Market Rental Return to the County. He summarized in the Draft Board Letter an extensive detailed description of all the terms, as well as in the Option Agreement. Mr. Wisniewski requested that the Commission endorse the Departments recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to execute this option. He explained that it does extend out over the water and has reason to believe the California Coastal Commission will approve this project. He stated the Board of Supervisors and the Design Control Board would review this and is scheduled on their agenda this month. Following this meeting the Regional Planning Department and the California Coastal Commission would also review it, because a LCP Amendment is required.

Chairman Searcy asked when the next public meeting would be held with the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Wisniewski stated the DCB meeting would be held at Burton Chace Park on March 15, 2007 at 2:00pm. He commented that the design would be available for viewing, pictures would be presented an extensive presentation would be given focusing on the DCB's responsibility and included that a discussion would be given on the LCP Amendment Requirement Over the Water Component. He stated the Department has worked diligently with the proposer to pull it back as much as possible from over the water, which in the past extended further. He said it maximizes Dry Storage as well as the number of boat slips that would be available for pulling boats out of storage and into the water ready for the clients to use for recreational purposes. He stated Mr. Greg Schem is an opponent of this project and would possibly continue to oppose this project. He said he has met with him as well as the proposer to reach an accommodation, which could not be done. Lastly, he stated the Harbormaster has looked at this project and senses that it would be safe and not interfere with the Boat Launch Ramp activity.

Commissioner Landini asked Mr. Wisniewski why extend over the water.

Mr. Wisniewski stated to maximize the amount of storage as well as to employ new technology, which is an actual crane that is built into the system. It will crane the vessels out over the water and put them into the water rather than using forklifts. He stated Burton Chace Park is across the water from this project and did not want the noise of forklifts emanating into Burton Chace Park and wanted something State of the Art. He stated this is not the first time this type of facility has been built in the United States and that the proposer was present to provide any additional background.

Commissioner Landini asked how long is the option.

Mr. Wisniewski stated he did not recall but would answer after public comment.

Commissioner Lesser asked what is the current net change in storage facility and what is being replaced in dry storage.

Mr. Wisniewski stated it is approximately 140, which is more storage and the option is for eighteen months with the ability to extend for another six or twelve months.

Commissioner Landini asked would it affect the option if the DCB changed the terms to their recommendations before submitting it to the Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Wisniewski stated it does not affect the option and the DCB will review this project again. It will first go through a conceptual review and approval and when it has its entitlements will go back to the DCB for architectural considerations.

Commissioner Landini asked Mr. Wisniewski to explain how he reached the Fair Market Value of the Lease Agreement and is a fair return of the property being received.

Mr. Wisniewski stated MAI Appraisers are hired to ensure that the Department is getting market value. The Department reviews rents at other facilities, square footage and rent on the land in which the Department is deciding to purchase. The Department usually exceeds Fair Market Rental Return that is an appraisal process as well as an economic process. He stated that the Department also uses an Economic Consultant to guide and negotiate the deal, look at the profit to the Lessee, return on value to the County and existing comparables. The Department holds the Lessees fees to the prior as much as possible to prevent drying the project and try to provide the minimum return that they will build at. Lastly, he stated the Department goes to a MAI Appraiser to validate what the Economic Consultant that has guided the Department in the negotiations.

Commissioner Lin asked if it is a Sub-Lease or a Lessee who will exercise the option.

Mr. Wisniewski said no the proposer is the perspective Lessee. He is not currently a Lessee in MdR. He is new and can't assign that right without County approval.

Chairman Searcy asked if there are boat facilities elsewhere.

Mr. Wisniewski stated he would like the proposer to address that information.

Mr. Tom Hogan Principal of Pacific Marina Development stated he is one of the partners along with Almar Marinas that are the proposers of this site. Almar has approximately 15 Marinas and 4500 slips in their portfolio. He stated they are a Marina company, developer, operator and manager and has been in the business well over 30 years.

Chairman Searcy asked what development is closest to this location.

Mr. Hogan stated right now they are managing and running a contracted purchase of the MdR Hotel facility for approximately one year and most of these properties are in California. He stated Almar does manage one facility in Hawaii and until July 2006 managed the Caba San Lucas Marina, which was sold in July. He added that the majority of properties are in California.

CHAIRMAN SEARCY OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Greg Schem stated he is the Lessee of Parcel 53 and agreed with Mr. Wisniewski that the Marina needs a Dry Stack Facility, but strongly objects and opposes to the applicants proposal for three major reasons: (1) it over develops Parcel 53 far in excess then what should be built there, (2) the project is built 100 ft. out over the water, and (3) the project is unfeasible because it violates the County's own design and guidelines set forth in the LCP. He said Basin H is the

busiest basin in MdR. He stated as Mr. Wisniewski pointed out this is the only public launching ramp and on a typical summer weekend this basin is intense with an additional 300 – 400 boats. It is dangerous and creates a chaotic environment in this area. The County should do a study of the congestion of Basin H to see if this is the appropriate size for development. He stated he understands maximizing revenue, building size and going as far out as the creative precedent building 100 feet out over the water. The building is 70 feet high, 85 feet above average site height level, and people in his slip will be looking out at a building towering over the water. The boat structure is a negative impact, it eliminates Mast-Up Boat Storage at Parcel 77 and estimates over 100 sailboats, which cannot use this facility and should be eliminated. In terms of entitlements the proposed project is inconsistent with the LCP. It violates Section 3C of the Specification and Minimum Standards of Architectural Treatment and Construction, which is incorporated in the LCP. The section states no structure can be built out over the water. These standards have been consistently applied throughout the Marina and would render this project unfeasible if applied to the design. He stated the site for this project, as he understood is public facility zoning, which does not permit this type of facility and is going to be very difficult to get this type of entitlement. He stated the project is too big, too tall, and too expensive. He commented that the proposed developer has an excellent reputation and would do a fine job in the Marina, but the project is too big. He stated time is being wasted chasing a project, which requires a major LCP Amendment and is inconsistent with the County's own design guidelines. He asked the Commission to overturn this project to be redesigned so that it would be in compliance with all applicable zoning and LCP requirements.

Mr. Wisniewski stated he made an error regarding Parcel 77. The Dry Storage space now is approximately 219 and for this project would be approximately 346-367 spaces. He stated the Department is very sensitive about Mast-Up Storage and to his understanding there will not be any spaces that won't be accommodated in the 30 on the proposed project. He explained that staff counted 19 on Parcel 77 and doesn't recall having more than 30 in quite some time. The Department would only consider going out over the water for this recreational boating facility and this is the only facility that would get permission to build out over the water. He commented that Mr. Schem has the adjacent leasehold and was one of the proposers, but was not selected. Lastly, Mr. Wisniewski stated he understood his motivation and appreciated him for being at the meeting to provide his comments. But the Department has worked with the California Coastal Commission staff and believes this project will ultimately be approved.

Ms. Nancy Marino commented that if developments are allowed to go out over the water, it is sure that others would also in the future. That is why this project is another prime example why it is so imperative to have a master plan. She stated if the County signed the Lease Option they would be obligated to certain performance and be obligated to sign the lease for this project before Beaches and Harbors has found itself a home. She commented that the LCP states this is Beaches and Harbors home and this is where it is designated to be. She asked what is the Fair Market Value of recreational land, because she doesn't think this is simply a financial decision that needs to be made, but that other aspects have not been carefully considered or integrated. She urged the Commission to give unanimous recommendation against signing this lease.

Ms. Marino continued by stating parking for this project will call for 376 to 397 boats and yet only 131 parking spaces are being provided. She asked where are people going to park on summer weekends. Only 1/3 of the people will have a place to park to access their boats. Public parking on Parcel 52R must be replaced as part of the redevelopment plan for Fisherman's Village and the County will relocate its landside uses to alternate facilities. She included that the LCP requires that all parking for private developments be included onsite so if they are looking to find overflow parking should look some other place. She stated that the California Coastal Commission has recommended that all of the Amendments be done at one time. The public is demanding that if the County wants to do a project that violates the existing LCP they

need to get these Amendments before they contract themselves and our tax dollars to these projects.

Ms. Marino commented this is our public land and money. The Commission is suppose to be the stewards not the masters of it. She stated being against this development, all of the individual projects and that this project is the developer's own rendering. Boats that are being displaced and pushed up on land are smaller boats not large boats and many don't have engines. Lastly, she called it a "wind shadow" and asked how are the smaller boats going to get out. This is going to disrupt the wind flow for all of the smaller boats that won't be able to be in the water and enjoy the experience on the water.

Mr. Donald Klein stated that he was opposed to the entire project. He concurred with Mr. Schem and Ms. Marino's findings and statements. He stated Mr. Wisniewski is doing what's called reverse engineering, which he has done several times. Can't imagine anyone approving a lease for 60 years without it being approved and can not assume that it will be approved. He stated it is ridiculous to submit this to the Board of Supervisors without it being approved by the Core of Engineers or being submitted to the California Coastal Commission. He stated the statement heard from Mr. Wisniewski seems that he has reason to believe that this is going to pass and that he must know something we don't know. Mr. Klein stated he has met with the California Coastal Commission and they had no indication of this project and thinks it is premature to send this to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

Ms. Carla Andrus stated she does not know how parking for Parcel GG is going to be moved to Fisherman's Village. Currently, there are five parking lots without enough parking in front of the Design Control Board. She asked if a decision was made to build a four or five parking level structure on prime waterfront property in front of Mothers Beach because the Design Control Board has already denied this project so moving it to Fisherman's Village is ridiculous. She stated there's no reason to expand Burton Chace Park and to leave Dock 77 where it is. It's not necessary or needed for technology to move boats into the water. She stated a master plan is needed and that the LCP Amendment should be done first for Parcel 55 then Parcel GG. Lastly, said she would like to submit the taped Design Control Board meeting from April 27, 2006, for their review.

Commissioner Delgado stated the way she understood the report was that it seemed to park itself and the project itself is parking on site but relocating public parking.

Mr. Wisniewski stated it does park itself. The parking currently at Parcel 52 is leased to the Lessee of Fisherman's Village. In the 60's when Fair Market Value was created as a Lease hold there was no parking for its uses. So they acquired Parcel W, which is a County parking lot in front of Parcel 56. Then on a month-to-month basis was rented from the County (Parcel 52) for overflow parking. When Fair Market Value projects came about they insisted that all of the parking needed to be built on Fair Market Value to accommodate all of their onsite uses, which eliminated all of the offsite parking lots on Parcel 52. So Fair Market Value will be fully parked for all of its uses including Dry Stack Storage.

Commissioner Lesser commented hearing on a regular basis that more recreational and open land is needed and it seems expanding Chace Park accomplishes that goal of creating open space and green area, but people are opposed to that. He stated what has also been heard many times is that small boat owners are being driven out of the Marina and there is less opportunity for small boat owners. He commented this is an opportunity for people to own a small boat in the Marina and keep it in Dry Stack Storage, but people are against it. He stated times have changed when the rules were first written and the County didn't have this technology. It will improve the facility if it goes over the water because it is more efficient and does a better job at bringing boats in and out of the water. This doesn't mean restaurants are going to be put out over the water, but it will increase money to the County, which is another

goal for this Commission. He stated thirteen million people own this Marina and one of the goals with being a small boat harbor is to raise revenue and this will accomplish that goal. He also stated hearing how congested it will be with 350 boats going into the water. He commented that approximately 98% of the boats are sitting in the slips on weekends, but it seems that only five percent will have twenty boats a week going out of Dry Storage Facility. He stated this is needed because some people use their boats on a regular basis and it seems positive to have boats available for people who want to use them periodically. The standard process used for developments is that the proposer has to have some concept that he is going to get something approved and that it is going to be financially viable before he goes through the effort of going through DCB planning the project and spending money. Lastly, he stated the public has several opportunities to make changes and should proceed with this concept and is in full favor of it for approval.

Chairman Searcy moved and Commissioner Delgado second a motion to approve Option for Lease to Facilitate Redevelopment – Parcel 52R and GG (Boat Central). The motion did not pass unanimously.

Chairman Searcy commented hearing people constantly saying there is no master plan. He stated it might be that people don't remember the master plan.

Mr. Wisniewski stated that in 1997 the Department composed an Asset Management Strategy, which when incorporated with the LCP is the planning document for redeveloping the Harbor. Since that time the Department has developed three other planning efforts such as: (1) a master planning effort for the Marina, which has gone through a public process for redeveloping the entire area, (2) the Department recently consulted to do a public outreach effort for the master planning of Chace Park, and (3) hired the same consultant to develop urban design guidelines that have been requested by DCB. He stated the Asset Management Strategy can be revisited and the Department would incorporate the three master planning efforts and the decisions from the Commission and Board of Supervisors, but to say there is no master plan for Marina del Rey is obscured. This is the Strategic Plan for Marina del Rey and was the first Strategic Planning document created from what he remembers in the history of the County of Los Angeles. Lastly, he stated after it was created the County embarked on a Strategic Planning effort for the entire County.

Chairman Searcy commented that changes occur and that it might need to be revisited so people can have an opportunity to make comments. Many people weren't around, don't remember, or if they do don't agree with it. This would give people a chance to see other items of planning, which will not be appended to it.

Mr. Wisniewski stated the Department would make that available. He commented that the current plans are to buy back a portion of the leasehold, acquire another leasehold and buy back a full leasehold. The 2 1/2 leaseholds the Department is acquiring back will expand the land base of Chace Park and double the land space. It will also quadruple the water areas the County controls.

Chairman Searcy stated some comments were made from the public and have been inserted into this particular transaction to make sure none of the Dockside facilities would be torn out until they were replaced. He stated it was documented into the RFP in response to the public.

Commissioner Landini denied the motion to grant this option. He stated Ms. Andrus and Mr. Klein have raised very good points that this project is very confusing. He stated his no-vote does not represent the details of the performance of the lease. By lease agreements coming to them first carry with them an inherent approval of the design concept and building out over the water without clarification of the process or explanation of it other than a sixty year lease based on 8 1/2 sends the wrong message to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. His opinion

of building out over the water is not good and allowing people to build structures over highways and streets, which the City and County of Los Angeles both have, resisted people who want to secure major air rights and create roadways as tunnels. He stated he sees this as a dangerous precedent in that direction and until this design is cleared up these cases are really backward. He stated the Master Plan and LCP Amendment should be in position first. At that time it should be submitted to the Commissioners to make technical adjustments. He stated this process was manipulating the Board of Supervisors and is being used to try and make a policy statement to give up air rights to waterways and is confused by it.

Chairman Searcy stated Commissioner Landini pointed out something interesting, which is the process. That if you go before the California Coastal Commission without some level and degree of specificity and plans you would be sent back. On the other hand you cant go before some of these processes without some level of detail and this is subject to the Coastal approval and the LCP Amendment. He stated it does give him some pause because it is a process issue. Some one has got to start the process. It does give an error of confusion. There is a lot of LCP Amendments that need to happen. The fact that the Local Coastal Commission meets or does not meet, putting us off, and going back and forth doesn't help either.

Mr. Wisniewski asked Commissioner Landini to explain what part of the process is unclear. He stated you can disagree with the process, but the Department has outlined the process innumerable times to this Commission. He commented that it is clear and would explain it economically why it has to be done this way. He stated no developer is going to proceed with a project through the very expensive entitlement process without knowing that it is going to work economically. He stated it is inappropriate and regrets that the Commission has initiated, discussed or implied that there is a manipulation going on in this process.

Commissioner Lesser commented that he respects his opinion and totally disagrees with it. No developer in his right mind will take the next step or any step without some guarantees. The developer who is doing this is taking huge risks, spending money like crazy and may be rejected anywhere along the process by the Design Control Board, California Coastal Commission, Board of Supervisors or the Regional Planning Commission.

Commissioner Delgado stated regarding the comment made pertaining to the Design Control Board assumed it was not in our purview.

Commissioner Landini stated the problem is that we are supposed to be looking at the technicality of the lease, rate of return and terms of the lease. But what the Commission has become is the voice of the first level of approval for the project. He commented that there is no approval or concept emanated by anyone and does not like that role. He stated the only vote he would do to stop that is to vote against the lease to build out over the air rights of the channels and that's why it is the technicality of the lease. It is not our role to say its ok to take these air rights.

Chairman Searcy moved to approve Option for Lease to Facilitate Redevelopment – Parcels 52R & GG (Boat Central) – Marina del Rey. Commissioner Lesser, Lin and Delgado second a motion. Commissioner Landini disapproved the motion. The motion was not passed.

6. STAFF REPORTS

a. Ongoing Activities

The Ongoing Activities Report was submitted and discussed at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN SEARCY OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Nancy Marino commented that Jack Hansworth is the new Coastal Commission staff member for MdR and located in Ventura. Al Padilla remains in the Long Beach office and Debra Lee is located in San Diego. She stated she appreciated Commissioner Landini's comments and was glad he reflected the voice of the community. She stated the review of the County's Implementation of the LCP is needed before more projects go forward. The County of Los Angeles and Beaches and Harbors met with the Coastal Commission and composed a final letter in July 2006. The County was attempting to negotiate language changes in the final report to be more advantageous to the County. The Coastal Commission has one year after the final report is published to negotiate to comply or not. She stated there is unnecessary delay with the entire process and this is leading to ill-advised development in MdR. She commented that a public review is needed and if there is a Master Plan the Asset Management Strategy is not a part of the LCP. The LCP is what should govern because there are so many exceptions that become the rule and there are too many Amendments being asked for. She stated she does not think it is in the long-term interest financially, socially or any other way for MdR to do it in this manner. She urged the Commissioners to give consideration to Commissioner Landini's comments in looking forward and advocating the Board of Supervisors to establish some sort of public review. She stated MdR is a community, a Master Plan is needed and to look at all the elements, which should be done to find the balance before going along with this project, this is not the way to do things.

Ms. Carla Andrus agreed with Ms. Marino's statement, but added that this process is dysfunctional and abusive. She stated this process has been done several times and that the LCP should be received first. She stated the Core of Engineers laid out this Marina and did it in a brilliant way. We should honor the land use plan we have before it is totally demolished. If developers want to be assured about their investments a meeting should be held with the Coastal Commission and public. She stated this is a public resource and it belongs to the people of the County of Los Angeles and it should be discussed with the voters whether or not the people want revenue or a valuable resource from developers. The voters have already stated what they want and the County gets a failing grade in the way revenue is handled.

b. PUBLIC REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**Small Craft Harbor Commission Mission Statement**

Mr. Wisniewski stated at the February 14, 2007 meeting the public requested a copy of the Small Craft Harbor Mission Statement. He said there is no Mission Statement, but included County Code Section 2.116.100, which relates to the Power's and Duties of the Commission.

Parcel 20 (Capri Apartments) Covenant for Affordable Housing

Mr. Wisniewski stated that the Capri Apartments have been fully executed and will be recorded in the near future.

The Public Request for Information was submitted and discussed at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN SEARCY OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Mary Ann Weaver stated in November 2006, tenants who participate in the Low-Income Senior Housing Program at Capri Apartments received a notice reflecting a rent increase of 6% effective January 7, 2007. She stated she contacted Mr. Blair Babcock of the Community Development Commission to discuss this information. Mr. Babcock advised her that the developer was refusing to sign the Covenant and informed her of what the rents should be and how they are calculated. He also stated he had informed the developer of this information by

telephone and followed up with a certified letter. However, he did not receive a response from the developer and that he was totally ignoring the information he was given. She stated Mr. Babcock suggested she file a complaint with Consumer Affairs. Ms. Weaver stated she informed him that she would also file a complaint with the Department of Fair Housing. She stated she spoke with the Director of the Department of Fair Housing who informed her that because the developer did not adhere to the County's request and abide by the laws of this state was considered to be fraud, which is criminal and should resolve in some type of consequences. She stated the Director also stated that low-income housing should have no charges for parking, which tenants are paying \$75 per month. He stated it was unheard of and it was illogical. She stated Mr. Babcock also agreed that tenants should not be paying for parking and was in the process of getting it eliminated.

Ms. Weaver stated she again spoke with Mr. Babcock on March 13, 2007 and submitted her with the correct amounts for rents. She stated due to the fact that the developer took his time to produce this information, the tenants are asking that the rents be corrected immediately starting the April 1, 2007. The tenants asked to be reimbursed by the developer with interest for overpaid rents and parking charges and that it be eliminated immediately. She stated the Covenant should have been put in place over one year ago before tenants occupied the apartments. Because this was not done the tenants feel that the developer took advantage of them and were put through unnecessary changes.

Mr. Faughnan stated he was not aware of this situation and that the Community Development Commission handles enforcement matters relating to Affordable Housing. He stated he does not advise them, but would contact Mr. Babcock to discuss this further. He does not know if there are any restrictions relating to parking fees related to Affordable Housing, but rents are set.

Chairman Searcy stated to Mr. Faughnan that the Commission would like a report pertaining to the discussion he has with Mr. Babcock.

Ms. Nancy Marino read the SCHC Statement, Section 2.116.100 – Powers and duties. She stated the Small Craft Harbor and recreation should be planned, financed and developed, but development should not be constructed. She stated the Asset Management Strategy is not part of the LCP, it does state that it is the County's responsibility to maximize the revenue potential for MdR Parcels. However, this is not what the LCP says. The LCP charges the County with maximizing the revenue potential from recreational uses on those Parcels. She said she feels this is a significant difference and the fact that the Asset Management Strategy is not a certified part of the LCP and has not gone through the appropriate public review process makes it outside the documents, which ought to govern MdR Redevelopment. She asked the Commission to support a public review process that includes Lessees, Board of Supervisors and County Officials. She stated the public believes outside the governing standards for this community, which is the LCP that the development is not in compliance with this program. She asked the Commission to support the public call for a public review of this Master Plan.

Ms. Carla Andrus stated that after several meetings Mr. Gardner decided to open the doors to Senior Citizens, but would not sign the Covenant. She stated that Mr. Gardner possibly had reasons for not signing the Covenant and would like to know why. She stated the Affordable Housing Policy so far is a disaster and is worse now than before.

Ms. Helen Garrett commented that the Commissioners are starting a process by permitting the Dockmaster of Panay Way to submit in writing documentation regarding Mr. Cardona, but Mr. Cardona and the public will only be given three minutes to respond and wants this changed. She stated if rents are calculated incorrectly it is done on purpose and the Commission has the ability as the tenant's landlord to make recommendations and expects them to do that.

7. COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. John Rizzo commented that the County receives \$33 million, which is spent in the Marina for Police and Dredging. He stated he called to get the land value 10-15 years ago and it was priced at \$10-15 per sq ft. and the open land was being sold between \$80 and \$240 per sq ft. He commented that it was incorrect when the County stated they receive 10-15% of the rents and has material on this issue. He stated that the policy is being changed because someone has been observing the Marina and sees how badly it is being run since their lawsuit.

Mr. Jun Yang a representative of POWER stated it was very disrespectful for Mr. Gardner and his associate (Mr. Horia Ispas, Dockmaster) to be late, answering the cell phone during the meeting and being unprepared. He stated Mr. Gardner said there have been no violations and that Mr. Cardona is a member of another harbor when in fact he was evicted.

Ms. Mary Ann Weaver informed the Commission that in September 2006 Paramount Studios filmed an episode at Capri Apartments, which inconvenienced the tenants. It began at 7:00 am – 10:30 pm. During that time tenants were not allowed to use the lobby for entrance or exit and the elevators were always occupied with equipment and staff. She stated some of the cars belonging to tenants were towed, because Paramount wanted to use those parking spaces. She stated compensation was to be paid to the tenants for the inconvenience as well as the landlords for the use of the dwelling. Days later a meeting was held by the tenants at that time found out that a tenant who was away on vacation car was towed (high end Mercedes Benz). The alarm system continued to sound, which ruined the battery and his car. From this the owner had to pay approximately \$2000 to have the car serviced. The tenants contacted the developer's corporate office to seek compensation and were told there was no compensation to be given. Ms. Weaver phoned the developer and asked if they were paid and was told that they were paid, but not for the tenants. She stated two tenants (former FBI Agent and Lawyer) decided to call Paramount and was informed that the developer paid \$200 for each tenant with the assumption that each unit was occupied, which would be 99 units. That would be a total of \$19,800, which the developer would have pocketed, which did not belong to him.

Mr. William Vsrezk stated he wanted a copy of the Marina Charter, evictions without cause are going to happen and tenants will start receiving their six months notices. Many tenants will not be given any option and doesn't know why they can't receive the same legal rights as someone squatting on land. He stated it is gross and injustice for people to be denied their civil rights. A legal liveaboard should have the same rights as a renter and shouldn't be able to be evicted without cause, compensation or relocation.

Chairman Searcy and Mr. Wisniewski stated they were not aware of any document called the Marina Charter. Mr. Faughnan stated he also was not aware of this document, but he could make a public request to the Department.

Mr. Wisniewski stated there was a Congressional Resolution, but there is no Charter.

Mr. Vsrezk apologized and stated maybe that is what he is looking for.

Mr. Wisniewski informed him to contact Mr. Gary Brockman to receive a copy.

Ms. Nancy Marino read Section 2.116.00 (B and D) from the Small Craft Harbor Mission Statement of Powers and Duties and said it seems that it is within the purview of this Board to make recommendations regarding items such as compensation for disruption to quiet enjoyment and feels that the Commission can make recommendations to moving allowances in terms of rent abatement or displaced tenants. She commented that a process, which consistently ignores or abrogates its existing agreements, frustrates the public and the LCP is one such agreement. She stated in this peace meal process so many exceptions have been

allowed that have become more of the rule than the exception and this is where one of the tenants frustrations lies. She included that conditions of development and other agreements that are systematically ignored with regard to the Capri Covenant that was a condition of approval for the Coastal Development permit and yet it took countless hours, legal fees and time of many members of the public simply to get it enforced and this is not right. Mitigation schedules are not included in the final conditions of Coastal Development Permits and it is up to the public to notice any inconsistencies in the final EIR. It should not be on the public to make compliance necessary it should be voluntary. If they are going to get these projects approved on these conditions they should willingly and in a timely manner move to meet those conditions.

Ms. Helen Garrett commented on the eviction of Mr. Rueben Cardona. She asked when Goldrich and Kest submits in writing their complaints against Mr. Cardona that this information be available to the public, POWER and Mr. Cardona and available at the next meeting. She stated she would provide the address of Mr. Cardona.

Chairman Searcy replied that this information would be available. Mr. Wisniewski commented that the Department would follow a normal process and when his information is provided the Department would ensure that he is notified.

Commissioner Lesser commented that a landlord could evict Mr. Cardona for any reason and was not any business of the Commissioners. He stated that the Commissioners don't like the concept of people being evicted without cause and have spent a lot of time and effort trying to resolve this issue. But it seems that the people have hostility towards them for trying.

Ms. Carla Andrus stated she would like to know if negotiations were given to Mr. Gardner, why he decided to sign the Covenant and that a report should be submitted. She commented that she would like the Asset Management Strategy reviewed.

Chairman Searcy and Mr. Wisniewski agreed.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Searcy adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Donna Samuels, Commission Secretary

Taped meetings can be purchased directly after all meetings.

Marina del Rey Redevelopment Projects
Descriptions and Status of Regulatory/Proprietary Approvals
As of May 8, 2007

Map Key	Parcel No. -- Project Name/Lessee	Lessee Name/ Representative	Redevelopment Proposed	Massing and Parking	Status	Regulatory Matters
1	42/43 - Marina del Rey Hotel/ Pacifica Hotels	Dale Marquis/ Mike Barnard	* Complete renovation	No changes	Proprietary -- term sheet under negotiation Regulatory -- to be determined	
2	52/GG -- Boat Central/ Pacific Marina Development	Jeff Pence	* 367-vessel dry stack storage facility * 30-vessel mast up storage space * Sheriff boatwright facility	Massing -- 70' high boat storage building partially over water and parking with view corridor Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site, public parking to be replaced on Parcel 56	Proprietary -- term sheet approved by BOS on July 2006; SCHC approved Option March 2007 Regulatory -- On DCB May 2007 agenda (continued from March 2007 meeting; April meeting cancelled)	LCP amendment to allow proposed use and to transfer Public Facility use to another parcel
3	55/56/W -- Fishermans Village/ Gold Coast	Michael Pashaie/ David Taban	* 132-room hotel * 65,700 square foot restaurant/retail space * 30-slip new marina * 28 foot-wide waterfront promenade	Massing -- Nine mixed use hotel/visitor-serving commercial/retail structures (eight are 1 or 2-story and one 60' tall hotel over ground floor retail/ restaurant), parking structure with view corridor Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site; must include parking for adjacent Parcel 61 lessee (Shanghai Reds) and replacement parking from Parcel 52	Proprietary -- lease documents approved by BOS December 2005 Regulatory -- DCB hearing May 2006, item continued; approved in concept July 2006. Regional Planning application in preparation	Shared parking analysis
4	64 - Villa Venetia/ Lyon Capital	Frank Suryan/ Mark Kelly	* 479-unit residential complex (includes 263 apartments and 216 condominium units) * 3,000 square-foot accessory retail space * 18-slip marina with water taxi slip * 28 foot-wide waterfront promenade and parkette	Massing -- Three buildings, two that are 140' tall, consisting of 11-12 floors of residential and 2 above-ground parking levels, and the third that is 84' tall, consisting of 6 floors over raised podium and plaza level with expansive covered parking Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site	Proprietary -- term sheet under negotiation Regulatory -- DCB conceptual approval October 2006; Regional Planning application filed December 2006	Affordable housing
5	1 -- Marina del Rey Landing/ Harbor Real Estate	Greg Schem	* New fuel dock facility with high-speed pumps and automatic payment * 3,300 square-foot dock mart and restrooms * New marina with 10 slips and transient berths * Public promenade and public view decks	Massing -- 1-story structure on the dock and on landside, each 19' tall Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site	Proprietary -- lease documents approved by BOS May 2006 Regulatory -- On DCB May 2007 agenda	
6	10/FF -- Neptune Marina/ Legacy Partners	Jim Andersen	* 526 apartments * 161-slip marina + 7 end-ties * 28 foot-wide waterfront promenade * Replacement of public parking both on and off site	Massing -- Four 55' tall clustered 4-story residential buildings over parking with view corridor Parking -- 103 public parking spaces to be replaced off site	Proprietary -- term sheet approved by BOS August 2004; lease documents in process Regulatory -- DCB approval in concept June 2006; Regional Planning application filed November 2006	LCP amendment to allow apartments on Parcel FF Parking permit to allow some replacement public parking off site Replacement of Parcel FF open space Affordable housing
7	9 -- Woodfin Suite Hotel and Vacation Ownership/ Woodfin Hotels	Mark Rousseau	* 19-story, 288-room hotel (152 hotel rooms and 136 timeshare suites) * 5-story, 332-stall parking structure * New public transient docks * 28 foot-wide waterfront promenade * Wetland park	Massing -- 19-story hotel with 5-story parking structure, 225' tall, on northern half of parcel with view corridor and wetland park on southern half Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site	Proprietary -- Term Sheet initialed Regulatory -- DCB initial hearing May 2006, item continued; approved in concept June 2006; Regional Planning application filed November 2006	Timeshare component Wetland
8	100/101 - The Shores/ Del Rey Shores	Jerry Epstein/ David Levine	* 544-unit apartment complex * 10 new public parking spaces	Massing -- Twelve 75' tall 5-story residential buildings Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site plus 10 public beach parking spaces	Proprietary -- Lease extension Option approved by BOS December 2006 Regulatory -- Regional Planning approval June 2006; BOS heard appeal on 2/27/07; continued to 3/6/07 where project was approved	
9	95/LLS -- Marina West Shopping Center/ Gold Coast	Michael Pashaie/ David Taban	* 72-unit apartment complex * 10,000 square-foot restaurant * 22,400 square-foot commercial space * Gateway parkette on Parcel LLS	Massing -- One 42' tall retail building, three 60' tall mixed-use residential/retail buildings and parkette Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site	Proprietary -- Term Sheet initialed Regulatory -- DCB initial hearing May 2006; item then on June, July, and September agenda; conceptual approval granted November 2006	
10	145 - Marina International Hotel/ Pacifica Hotels	Dale Marquis/ Mike Barnard	* Complete renovation	No changes	Proprietary -- term sheet under negotiation Regulatory -- to be determined	
11	OT -- Admiralty Courts/ Goldrich & Kest Industries	Jona Goldrich/ Sherman Gardner	* 114-unit senior care facility * 3,000 square feet of retail space * Replacement public parking both on and off site * Public accessway from Washington to Admiralty	Massing -- One 5-story residential (senior) building over ground-floor retail and parking, 65' tall Parking -- all required project parking to be located on site; 92 public parking spaces to remain on site, 94 public parking spaces to be replaced off site near Marina Beach	Proprietary -- term sheet approved by BOS August 2005; lease documents in process Regulatory -- DCB conceptual approval August 2005; Regional Planning application filed May 2006, awaiting hearing date	LCP amendment to allow proposed use Parking permit for senior care facility Parking permit to allow some replacement public parking off site
12	33/NR -- The Waterfront	Ed Czucker	* 292 apartments * 32,400 square-foot restaurant/retail space * Rooftop observation deck * Replacement public parking both on and off site	Massing -- Three 5-story mixed use residential/retail buildings (two 44' tall and one 61' tall) with view corridor Parking -- 121 public parking spaces to be replaced on site, 70 public parking spaces to be replaced off site	Proprietary -- lease documents in process and economic terms being negotiated Regulatory -- DCB concept approval August 2004; revised project pending DCB consideration	LCP amendment to allow proposed use Parking permit to allow some replacement public parking off site
13	27 -- Jamaica Bay Inn/ Pacifica Hotels	Dale Marquis/ Mike Barnard	* 69 additional hotel rooms * Renovate balance of property * Marina Beach Promenade	Massing -- 4-story, 45' tall, hotel expansion with view corridor Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site	Proprietary -- lease documents approved by BOS May 2006 Regulatory -- DCB conceptual approval obtained October 2005; Regional Planning application filed December 2005; Scheduled for June 2007 RP Commission agenda	
14	1R -- Marriott Residence Inn/ Pacifica Hotels	Dale Marquis/ Mike Barnard	* 147-room hotel * Replacement of public parking both on and off site * Marina Beach Promenade	Massing -- Two hotel buildings above parking, 45' tall, with view corridor Parking -- 197 public parking spaces to remain on site, 20 or 89 public parking spaces to be replaced off site depending on intersection project	Proprietary -- lease documents approved by BOS Oct 2006 Regulatory -- DCB approved in concept February 2006; Regional Planning application in preparation	LCP amendment to allow proposed use Parking permit to allow some replacment public parking off site
15	21 -- Holiday Harbor Courts/ Goldrich & Kest Industries	Jona Goldrich/ Sherman Gardner	<u>Phase 1</u> * 5-story, 29,300 square-foot mixed-use building (health club, yacht club, retail, marine office) * 87-slip marina * 28 foot-wide waterfront promenade and pedestrian plaza <u>Phase 2 (Parcel C)</u> * Westernmost portion of land to revert to County for public parking	Massing -- One 56' tall commercial building with view corridor Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site, including 94 replacement spaces from OT and Parcel 20 boater parking	<u>Phase 1</u> Proprietary -- lease documents in process Regulatory -- DCB conceptual approval obtained August 2005; Regional Planning application (landside) filed July 2006 <u>Phase 2 (Parcel C)</u> DCB hearing May 2006, item continued	CDP for landside from Regional Planning CDP for waterside from Coastal Commission Parcel 20 CDP amendment from Regional Planning to transfer Parcel 20 Phase 2 (6,025 sf yacht club, 2,300 sf office space, 231 parking spaces) to Parcel 21
16	19 -- Administration Building/ Department of Beaches and Harbors (Alternate sites being considered)	N/A	* 26,000 square-foot County administration building	Massing -- One 56' tall building consisting of 2 floors office space over 3 parking levels Parking -- all parking required of the project to be located on site	Proprietary -- lease documents in process with Parcel 20 lessee for parcel reversion Regulatory -- DCB agenda May 2006 and November 2006; DCB workshop held January 2007	See Item #2 above

**MINUTES
OF
MARINA DEL REY
DESIGN CONTROL BOARD**

January 25, 2007

**Department of Beaches and Harbors
Burton Chace County Park
Community Building – 13650 Mindanao Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292**

Members Present: Susan Cloke, Chair, First District
Katherine Spitz, ASLA, Vice-Chair, Third District
David Abelar, Second District
Peter Phinney, A.I.A., Fourth District

Members Absent: Tony Wong, P.E., [Excused]

Department Staff Present: Stan Wisniewski, Director
Charlotte Miyamoto, Chief, Planning Division
Chris Sellers, IT Technical Support Analyst
Maureen Sterling, Acting Secretary

County Staff Present: Tom Faughnan, Principal Deputy County Counsel
Russ Fricano, Regional Planning Department

Guests Testifying: Henrik T. Gharajeh, ANI Sign Design
Michael Morrisette, General Manager, Café del Rey
Luis Russo, Marina del Rey Resident
Nancy Vernon Marino, Marina del Rey Resident
Carla Andrus, Marina del Rey Resident
Charles Hicks, Marina del Rey Resident
Richard T. Miller, Marina Strand Colony I Resident
Richard Miller, Marina del Rey Resident
David Levine, Marina del Rey Lessees Association
Bruce Russell, Marina City Club Resident
Robert Van de Hoek, Area Resident
Steve Freeman, Oxford Triangle Resident
Marcia Hanscom, Area Resident
Eugene Haberman, Marina Strand Colony II Resident
Jonathan Launer, Area Resident
Gerry Maxey, Area Resident
Dan Gottlieb, Marina Strand Colony I Resident

DeDe Audet, Oxford Triangle Resident
Dr. David De Lange, Marina del Rey Resident
Jeannette Boller, Venice Resident
Dorothy Franklin, Area Resident
Nicholas Coster, Challenges Foundation
Mr. Siamons, Area Resident
Greg Schem, Managing Director, Harbor Real Estate, L.P.
Leslie Scott, Area Resident
Mary Ann Weaver, Area Resident
Rosyln Walker, Marina del Rey Resident
Bethany Gorfine, Marina del Rey Colony I Resident

1. **Call to Order, Action on Absences and Pledge of Allegiance**

Ms. Cloke called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. She stated this would be Ms. Spitz last meeting and that the Board was sad to see her leave. Ms. Spitz led the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Spitz (Phinney) moved to excuse Mr. Wong from the meeting.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Spitz (Phinney) moved to approve the Minutes of November 16, 2006 with changes as submitted. [Unanimous consent]

3. **Design Control Board Reviews**

A. **Parcel 131 – Café del Rey – DCB #06-019**

Approval of the record of the DCB's November 16, 2006 action for conditional approval of signage.

Mr. Wisniewski stated a representative from Café del Rey would like to address to the Board before the action is taken.

Ms. Cloke replied the action had already been taken, unless the representative feels the action is not accurate. Ms. Cloke asked the representative if he was challenging what actually happened at the prior meeting.

Mr. Morrisette replied that he had an update.

Ms. Cloke said that matter was not on the agenda for discussion, public hearing or updates. She suggested that if he had a question, he address the Board or staff during a break.

Ms. Spitz (Phinney) moved to approve DCB #06-019 with the changes as discussed in Agenda Item 2. [Unanimous consent]

B. Parcels - 95 & LLS Marina Gateway – DCB #06-022

Approval of the record of the DCB's November 16, 2006 action for conditional approval of redevelopment

Ms. Spitz (Phinney) moved for approval of DCB #06-022 with the changes as discussed in Agenda Item 2. [Unanimous consent]

5. New Business

A. Parcels 97 – Beyond Beauty Supply – DCB #06-023

Consideration of signage.

Ms. Miyamoto gave a brief overview of the project.

Mr. Phinney asked Mr. Fricano if there was a County ordinance that a business to have a street frontage sign approximately three square feet per lineal foot of building frontage.

Mr. Fricano stated yes and further explained that the wall frontage of the business was existing and consistent with the other signage in the shopping plaza.

Public Comments

Ms. Marino commented that Marina del Rey tenants should be given every possible courtesy and expedience in getting their business underway. She felt that as long as the signage was within the constraints, then it should be approved.

Board Comments

Mr. Phinney felt the sign was overscaled for the building. He said he would like to see the letters pulled closer together. He suggested if the applicant had only a single center entrance into the store, that only the center area contain the sign.

Ms. Cloke felt the sign was counterproductive to the applicant's business interest, in that customers wouldn't know where the entrance was. The Board was suggesting an entry that would help people know what the applicant was selling and where it was being sold.

Mr. Abelar asked Mr. Fricano if the applicant could legally erect the proposed sign.

Mr. Fricano replied yes.

Ms. Spitz (Cloke) moved to continue DCB #06-019. [Unanimous consent]

B. Workshop - Alternative Location for new Department Administration Building

Workshop to consider alternative locations for a new Department Administration Building, other than on a portion of Parcel 20 as proposed by the Department.

Mr. Wisniewski gave a brief presentation of the proposed location, an explanation of the workshop map and list of possible County-controlled alternative locations within the Marina.

Public Comment - Two minutes per speaker (with one minute for staff response, if necessary)

Mr. Hicks voiced concern about the widening of Admiralty Way. He was concerned that future development would bring more cars and noise to the area. In addition, he had concerns about the ingress and egress at Marina City Club and suggested putting in a stoplight to prevent future accidents.

Mr. Russo voiced concern about the increasing rents and fees for boat slips.

Mr. Miller inquired about the dimensions of the proposed administration building and the timing of the Local Coastal Plan (LCP) Amendment.

Mr. Wisniewski advised Mr. Miller that staff could provide a copy of the November 9, 2006 staff report that outlined all the information of the proposal.

Ms. Cloke questioned Mr. Wisniewski about the timing for the LCP Amendment.

Mr. Wisniewski said he could not give a time since the regulatory process will start traditionally after the Department has gone through the Design Control Board.

Mr. Miller asked if this had any connection with the LCP review that is currently in process with the California Coastal Commission.

Mr. Wisniewski replied yes, it could.

Mr. Miller said he would like the Marina to stay the way it is. He felt increased traffic would make it dangerous for the residents to enter and exist their buildings.

Mr. Levine said there were a number of underutilized County parking lots that could be considered, several of which were located near visitor-serving commercial establishments. He stated that while much of the focus was on the Mother's Beach area, more attention might be paid to the area surrounding the Lincoln Boulevard, Bali Way and Admiralty Way intersection. He also suggested Parcels UR, 94 and 150 as alternatives, stating that development on any of these three parcels would minimize the impact of additional traffic trips on the bulk of the residential neighbors within the Marina and Venice. Overflow parking could be accommodated in Trizec Towers.

Ms. Spitz asked Mr. Levine if he could clarify where Parcel 94 was located.

Mr. Wisniewski said Parcel 94 is the parking lot for the Marina Professional building and is not under County control. Further, Parcel 150 will soon be coming to the Design Control Board to tear the building down, and is not of adequate size.

Mr. Russell felt the proposed administration building was in an inappropriate place. He commented that it was unfair for so much parking to be given to the Department while the public going to Mother's Beach would be battling for limited parking spaces.

Mr. Van de Hoek suggested a "no action" alternative, saying the administration building should remain in its current location. He also suggested keeping staff in the trailers for the time being, or letting them occupy some of the available space in Fisherman's Village. He also mentioned there was no Master Plan and that there was a need to look at the cumulative impacts of various projects coming to the Design Control Board.

Mr. Freeman said he would like to see the proposed parcel used for recreational and community services, rather than a County administration building. He suggested putting the administration building on the edge of the Marina in a less useful area. He added that recreational uses in the Marina are being threatened on many parcels for a lot of different reasons, and this must be brought to bear on each consideration or the Marina will not be a recreational facility anymore.

Ms. Marino stated Parcel 19 is zoned for marine commercial, specifically a yacht club. The LCP is the law and the proposed administration building would require a Plan amendment. The Department should get the amendments first. Ms. Marino further stated the proposed office development would have community party rooms that would be plunked down right in the middle of a residential area. Quiet enjoyment for all the surrounding tenants will be disrupted with daytime office traffic coming into the department and party traffic at all hours of the days, nights and weekends.

Ms. Marino said office use is the lowest priority on waterside parcels and marine commercial is highest. In addition, the lot the County wants for mast-up storage is zoned and intended for an office building. The reason the County wants the lot is to take the small boats out of wet slips and replace them with larger slips and boats. She said the Department should not waste the public, Design Control Board, Small Craft Harbor and Regional Planning's time and taxpayer dollars bringing projects to the Board that are not in compliance with the law.

Ms. Andrus asked Mr. Wisniewski if it was correct that his current offices occupied Parcel 52/GG and 62 and that the Department does not have a required LCP amendment to redesignate or transfer that use.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that was correct.

Ms. Andrus asked if the Department put out a request for proposals (RFP) for a dry stack storage without an LCP amendment, which was required at Parcel 52/GG.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that the RFP disclosed that the developer would need to obtain an amendment.

Ms. Andrus said that without the amendments in place, the dry stack storage had been aggressively pushed through the process over strong objections from the public. Furthermore, the Board of Supervisors had signed the term sheet and the lease documents are in process.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that Ms. Andrus was incorrect.

Ms. Andrus asked what was incorrect.

Mr. Wisniewski replied it was incorrect that there were strong objections from the public. He further replied that the voting community had resoundingly supported dry stack storage.

Ms. Cloke asked if the project had gone through the public process yet.

Mr. Wisniewski replied no, stating the process had not been pushed aggressively and still had countless public hearings to go through.

Ms. Andrus asked if the Coastal Commission could deny the project.

Mr. Wisniewski replied highly unlikely. They are very much in favor of dry stack storage.

Ms. Andrus asked if there should be a public review of the Master Plan and an LCP review by the Coastal Commission. She said there were much more important issues to the public than where new Department offices should go.

Ms. Hanscom expressed concerns about what is being planned in the Marina. She said she asked staff prior to the meeting what the rationale was for even moving, but never heard back. She also said the Department also currently utilizes several parking lots that are on the Ballona Wetland Ecological Reserve. She expressed concern about traffic in the Marina and would like to see a Master Plan.

Mr. Wisniewski briefly explained the benefit of locating the Department in one facility and turning the current administration building into a public safety complex shared by the Sheriff, Coast Guard, Fire Department, Lifeguards and Harbor Patrol. He further stated the Chief Administrative Office and Sheriff's Department permit the two parking lots next to the Ballona Reserve. The Department of Fish and Game is aware of the permits and there is a study group studying the ultimate use on how Area A is

going to be developed. The Department of Fish and Game has not yet indicated if those parking lots need to be removed, but if they do, they will be removed immediately.

Mr. Haberman questioned whether the proposed administration building would increase traffic at Admiralty Way and Via Marina, as opposed to a having a yacht club there. In addition, he asked why the administration office must be located in the Marina. He suggested leasing space in the new office complex being built in Playa Vista. He asked if an economic study had been done to compare the cost of the County operating the property versus revenue loss by not using the parcel for rental property.

Mr. Launer said there was a need to place a left turn signal at Lincoln Boulevard and Mindanao Way.

Mr. Maxey suggested shrinking the Department staff and moving them into one of the spaces in Fisherman's Village.

Mr. Gottlieb said a staff member of the Department of Regional Planning advised him that the land south of the Shores Project was vacant.

Ms. Cloke advised Mr. Gottlieb to speak to Mr. Fricano regarding comments made by the Department of Regional Planning.

Ms. Audet expressed concerns that moving the administration building would create traffic for the residents of the surrounding communities.

Dr. De Lange said the law gives small boaters the first priority and marina-serving purposes must come first. He asked Mr. Wisniewski what would be his first and second alternative location choices if the Coastal Commission did not approve of the proposed location. In addition, he asked for the height and total footprint square footage of the proposed building.

Mr. Wisniewski said that was the purpose of having the public workshop. He further said this was the plan the County had and was the most economical parcel the County could identify. He said the County was not eliminating marine commercial use but rather moving it to where the public building was already allocated in the LCP. In addition, the proposed building would be twenty six thousand square feet. Mr. Wisniewski said the Chief Administrative Office of space management did a study that verified Department needs, including the addition of a public facility meeting space.

Dr. De Lange said moving the building was not an adequate answer, and that marine and small boating uses should be given highest priority.

Staff Comments

Mr. Wisniewski gave a brief presentation about the building. In response to Mr. Levine's comments, he replied that Parcel 94 was currently used as parking for the adjacent office building on Parcel 75. Further, Parcel UR is currently a public parking lot in which twenty parking spaces are used for the public library. He said it was the County's future plan to provide permanent parking for the library on that site and turn the rest of the parking lot into open space, and that public parking would be relocated to an area close to Chace Park. He said Parcel 150 was an old bank building that had some interim uses, but the County didn't believe the site was large enough to accommodate an administration building. The County is proposing to tear the building down and replace it with an interim landscaping plan, which will come before the Design Control Board. He said converting the parcel into open space would open the view corridors to the water from Lincoln Boulevard.

Mr. Wisniewski said the County needs a place to move their offices. He said that having a public safety complex was something that could be enjoyed by the entire community, since it would provide a greater level of public service.

In response to the economic analysis question, Mr. Wisniewski said the LCP allocates space in the Marina for a public office. To turn that into revenue-producing would not be necessary, as the Marina has not even reached fifty percent of the all the development that is authorized by the LCP for Marina del Rey. Mr. Wisniewski further stated that being in the Marina or close to it was both important for the administration and convenient to the public. Lastly, Mr. Wisniewski mentioned that having a facility within the Marina would allow the Department to lock in low rent space, in lieu of escalating office space prices in Marina del Rey and the Westside.

Board Comments

Mr. Abelar asked Mr. Wisniewski where the 90 Freeway was proposed to enter the Marina, and if it was close to Parcel 150.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that the freeway was under an environmental impact review, with three alternative endings. One alternative would have the freeway connect with Bali Way and two others would have it connect further northwest of Bali Way.

Mr. Abelar asked if the 90 Freeway could come into Parcel 150 if the parcel was left as open space.

Mr. Wisniewski replied no.

Mr. Phinney asked if the County had considered using Parcel P, the Oxford Flood Control Basin.

Mr. Wisniewski said no. He said the County was working with the Department of Public Works to open a portion the Oxford Flood Control Basin to the public using decomposed granite as walkways.

Mr. Phinney asked if the County could build on Parcel 62.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that he would like to see a public safety complex there not exceed two stories, and to expand the Department of Beaches and Harbors there would require additional stories.

Mr. Phinney asked if Parcel 52/GG would be enough land area to approximate the size of Parcel 19.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that it would, however the County felt that since there was a commercial boat repair yard in the area, Parcel 52/GG would be an ideal location for dry stack storage instead.

Mr. Phinney asked if there was dry stack storage somewhere between Parcels 49M, 49R and 49S, or only mast-up storage.

Mr. Wisniewski said there was no dry stack storage in Marina del Rey.

Mr. Phinney asked if it was being proposed there.

Mr. Wisniewski replied no. He said that would displace parking for vehicles bringing boats in to launch. He added that Parcel 49S is mast-up storage with 302 spaces, 49R is parking for people who launch their vessels and 49M is parking included in the Chace Park master plan.

Mr. Abelar asked why the County didn't take part of Parcel 77 for the administration building.

Mr. Wisniewski said the County was proposing that all of Parcels 47, 77 and 45 be used in the expansion of Chace Park, and the County did not feel it was appropriate to put administrative offices in a park.

Mr. Phinney said that if Parcel 49M was being planned as a multi-level parking structure in order to provide public access to Chace Park, then Parcel 77 was more than enough land area to approximate what the County was looking for at Parcel 19. He suggested limiting the expansion of Chace Park to include Parcels 47, 45, the existing park and a portion of Parcel 77, then devoting the remainder of Parcel 77 to the administration building and incorporating that with the public structure parking on Parcel 49M.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that he would like to keep Chace Park open space without an office.

Mr. Abelar asked if Parcel 45 would be used for the Chace Park and if there would be parking for boaters.

Mr. Wisniewski said yes, that the County had an option to purchase two parcels from the lessee and intended on exercising that option and building new slips and operating the anchorage.

Mr. Abelar asked what would happen to the boaters when the County started rebuilding.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that rebuilding would be done on a phased basis.

Ms. Spitz said she found it heartening to hear that the building did not need to be revenue producing, and she hoped one of the values would be sustainability. She felt the building would have civic presence, and was probably better suited as a gateway building than a building along the water. She suggested Parcels 51, 150 and some of the buildings along Washington Boulevard as places where the building could become a gateway to the Marina. She suggested that the lowest floors on the proposed building should be opened to the County, public and community and visitor serving uses and not to parking.

Mr. Wisniewski said the site was of very limited site, and it would be hard to achieve any other use at the base.

Ms. Spitz said that parking at the ground floor would destroy the pedestrian and public interface with the building.

Ms. Cloke said she felt that neither a parking structure nor an office building was an appropriate waterfront use for a recreational Marina. She felt it would be appropriate to analyze the cost of a new building versus leasing property in or outside of the Marina.

Ms. Cloke said gateway concept was very important and that she would like to see the County building on the edge of the Marina, and that there may be an opportunity along Washington Boulevard. She agreed that it would be valuable for all the working members of the Department to be housed in the same building.

Ms. Cloke then said she would like to talk about the Marina overall, and how the Design Control Board processes applications and how this building fits into that process. She said she knew that Supervisor Knabe put in a motion about comprehensive planning. She stated she doesn't really know how to get a good handle on this but she thought she would like to ask staff to look at that question and come

back with a proposal that could be discussed and forwarded to the Board of Supervisors, so that everyone could look at all these proposals - maybe on a big Saturday workshop or something - and have some understanding of what the trade-offs were.

Ms. Cloke said she would like to give staff some time to analyze and review the public comments that were made and come back with maybe two or three alternative locations that took the public and Board comments into consideration. She said the building itself should reflect the values that the Marina should present to other entities that will be building in it, and to the residents of the Marina and the County and all its visitors.

Ms. Cloke asked for a report that would include the analysis and review of all the comments and suggestions made by the Commissioners and the public.

Mr. Wisniewski said absolutely.

Ms. Cloke asked Mr. Wisniewski if he had in mind a reasonable amount of time for that to take, so people know when they might want to plan on coming back.

Mr. Wisniewski said the Department would come back with a preliminary report with a time frame at the next meeting.

Ms. Cloke said that would be appreciated. She then thanked everybody that came to the workshop and concluded Item #5B.

6. Staff Reports

All reports were received and noted.

7. Comments from the Public

Ms. Boller said the Marina would be better served if the administration building were outside the Marina, such as along Washington Boulevard, Playa Vista or Fisherman's Village. She said she would like to see the catch basin become a protected bird sanctuary and was concerned about parking structures being built on the beaches.

Ms. Franklin said the members of the Board should not resign over the proposed LCP amendments; they should carry on their responsibilities until the Coastal Commission approves the amendments. She then asked when the public would get a review of the County's Master Plan, and said she would like to see a moratorium on all upcoming buildings and remodeling projects.

Mr. Coster requested permission for one slip space to use for a boat for the Challenges Foundation, which teaches and takes out disabled divers.

Mr. Siamons said the proposed administration building looks like a temple. He complained the County presentation was done after the public spoke and that Mr. Wisniewski's conscience is similar to President Bush and his oil factories.

Ms. Cloke announced that, due to time constraints, the public speaking time had been changed to one minute.

Ms. Hanscom said that open space should not be at the expense of more density. She said that the prior gas station on Parcel 51 was still leaking solvents into the wetlands and that there were no native plants there.

Mr. Schem felt that dry stack storage was an excellent idea for Parcel 52/GG, but also felt that it should not be too high.

Ms. Scott said she would like to see new Marina development include pedestrian and bicycle paths.

Mr. Haberman said the public would support the Design Control Board at the California Coastal Commission. He also complained that traffic was exceeding the LCP limitations.

Ms. Marino was unhappy with being allowed only one minute to comment. She suggested the Board send their strongest recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to undertake the following two actions in tandem: First, create a new, coherent master plan that will serve the needs of all people in Los Angeles County. Second, impose a moratorium on all projects that have not yet broken ground until the completion of a new master plan. She said the County seeks to get all of its projects approved, which rely on exceptions in the LCP, and the County should get the amendment first. She recommended the Design Control Board adopt a resolution to streamline the approvals process, in fairness to lessees and the public. She felt the Board should not consider any project that knowingly violated the LCP, until the amendment was approved by the California Coastal Commission. She asked the Design Control Board to demand a review of the master plan.

Mr. Gottlieb felt park views would be damaged by development.

Ms. Weaver felt that Parcel 9U would better serve as a park with a jogging track.

Ms. Walker asked how many employees would be housed in the proposed administration building. She said that she see tons of trucks coming and out of the current administration building and would like to know if these trucks will be parked at the proposed new building. She asked about the future location of the County vehicle repair shop.

Ms. Gorfine spoke about traffic accidents on Via Marina and felt the potential County employee traffic would increase traffic in general there. She was opposed to building any more condominiums, hotels or apartments in the same area.

Mr. Van de Hoek said the end of Bora Bora Way still has herons and egrets roosting in the pine and eucalyptus trees, and asked that the trees not be removed. He said he heard that a Banana Republic and movie theaters were being proposed at Dock 52, and wondered how that could be compatible with boat storage yards. He felt the future of the Department of Beaches and Harbors would be downsizing, based on automation with cell phones, e-mail, computers, remote sites and employees working at home. He said he heard that all the public beaches would eventually be taken over by the Department of Parks and Recreation, so there would be no need for a larger building.

Public comment closed.

9. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maureen Sterling
Acting Secretary for the Design Control Board

DRAFT

**MINUTES
OF
MARINA DEL REY
DESIGN CONTROL BOARD**

March 15, 2007

**Department of Beaches and Harbors
Burton Chace County Park Community Building
13650 Mindanao Way, Marina del Rey, CA 90292**

Members Present: Susan Cloke, Chair, First District
Peter Phinney, A.I.A., Fourth District
Tony Wong, P.E., Fifth District

Members Absent: David Abelar, Second District

Department Staff Present: Stan Wisniewski, Director
Charlotte Miyamoto, Chief, Planning Division
Chris Sellers, IT Technical Support Analyst
Maureen Sterling, Acting Secretary
Kimberly Monroe, Secretary

County Staff Present: Tom Faughnan, Principal Deputy County Counsel
Russ Fricano, Department of Regional Planning

Guests Testifying: Charles Balber, Cruz-Balber Architects
Greg Dallal, Caruso Affiliated
Jeff Penne, Pacific Marina Development
Roger Van Wert, Allen Matkins
Donna Andrews, CES
Tom Hogan, Pacific Marina Development
Jamie Meyers, DC Martin Partners
Richard Thompson, DC Martin Partners
Steve Weinman, Dock 77
Greg Schem, Harbor Real Estate Group
Jerry Dunlap, My Boat Works
Nancy Marino, Marina del Rey Resident
Dorothy Franklin, Marina del Rey Resident
Roz Walker, Marina del Rey Resident
Carol Kirschenbaum, Marina del Rey Resident
Bill Anderson, Marina del Rey Resident
David Levine, MDR Lessees Association
Steve Kern, H&S Yacht Sales

Jun Yang, Power Associates
Carla Andrus, Marina del Rey Resident

1. **Call to Order, Action on Absences and Pledge of Allegiance**

Ms. Cloke called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. Mr. Wong led the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Phinney (Wong) moved to excuse Mr. Abelar from the meeting.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Cloke asked about revision she sent in for the January 25, 2007 Minutes that did not make it through to the final version.

Mr. Sellers apologized and explained that the materials for the meeting were sent out to the Board members prior to receiving the corrections.

Ms. Cloke (Phinney) moved to continue the January Minutes until the next meeting. [Unanimous consent]

Ms. Cloke asked if there were any comments or corrections to the Minutes of February 22, 2007.

Mr. Faughan had one minor correction to a statement he made on page 12.

Ms. Cloke accepted the correction from Mr. Faughan, and made minor word changes and deletions of her own.

Ms. Cloke (Phinney) moved to approve the Minutes of February 22, 2007 as amended. [Unanimous consent]

Ms. Miyamoto introduced Kimberly Monroe to the Board as the permanent Design Control Board Secretary.

Ms. Cloke welcomed Ms. Monroe and thanked Ms. Sterling for all of her hard work and patience with the Board.

3. **Design Control Board Reviews**

A. **Parcel 97 – Beyond Beauty Supply – DCB #06-023**

Approval of the record of the DCB's February 22, 2007 action for conditional approval of signage.

Mr. Phinney (Wong) moved to approve DCB #06-023 as submitted. [Unanimous consent]

B. Parcel 91- Marina del Rey Outrigger Canoe Club – DCB #07-001

Approval of the record of the DCB's February 22, 2007 action for conditional approval of storage cabinet installation.

**Mr. Phinney (Wong) moved to approve DCB #07-001 as submitted.
[Unanimous consent]**

C. Parcel 50- Waterside Marina del Rey – DCB #07-002

Approval of the record of the DCB's February 22, 2007 action for conditional approval of ATM installation.

**Mr. Phinney (Wong) moved to approve DCB #07-002 as submitted.
[Unanimous consent]**

4. Old Business

A. Parcels 50 – Waterside Marina del Rey – DCB #07-002-B

Further consideration of ATM installation (awning and lighting).

Ms. Miyamoto gave a brief overview of the project.

Mr. Balber stated that while they did provide an alternate design for an extended awning and light fixture, they felt that the original awning design was adequate for protection from the elements. Mr. Balber stated they had changed the light fixture to one that has an articulated yoke that would allow changing the angle of the light. He stated they were proposing a high-pressure sodium 100-watt light, which was in keeping with the balance of lighting in the shopping center.

Public Comments

None

Board Comments

Ms. Cloke had concerns about the size of the existing awning for rain protection, and didn't think the alternate awning would upset the rhythm of the center since there were currently different size awnings over different entrances.

Mr. Dallal stated the concerns were with the two-foot standard that Wells Fargo has with their other ATM machines. He said he didn't know if the current exhibits adequately reflected what the awning currently looks like, but it could not be raised to maintain the same pitch because there were issues above it with the electrical connections. He said the alternate awning design would have a different pitch compared to the awning next to it and it would look odd.

Ms. Cloke asked the applicant if they would want their customers getting wet if it rained.

Mr. Dallal responded that Wells Fargo felt a two-foot clearance was adequate for their customers. He stated that Wells Fargo had this size awning on their other properties, and that some Wells Fargo ATMs did not have coverage at all.

Mr. Balber stated he understood the concerns of the Board, but that Wells Fargo has two feet as the standard that they use for their ATMs.

Ms. Cloke responded that the Board looks at standards for logo and branding issues, but the architectural standards when doing designs is three feet.

Mr. Wisniewski agreed with the applicants' argument, stating that a different pitch would look odd.

Ms. Cloke responded that she understood both sides of the argument and said she didn't realize that raising the awning would raise the pitch as well.

Mr. Balber had concerns about raising the awning because it would cause problems in the connection to the wall and would require refinishing quite a large area.

Ms. Cloke responded that she understood, but she felt that three feet was the standard for design.

Mr. Phinney stated that he didn't have a strong feeling about it, but agreed that a pitch change would have an adverse visual impact. Referring to the existing condition photo and the computer-generated image, he stated if the applicant was going to argue that the pitch would radically alter the appearance of the center, they should show the center and the pitch altered to see how bad it would be.

Ms. Cloke stated that she visited the shopping center and observed that there were many different types of awnings in the shopping center.

Mr. Phinney was concerned about the brightness of a 100-watt bulb.

Mr. Balber responded that the light fixture would be brighter, because it would have to meet the state codes.

Ms. Cloke stated a motion could be in place that if Staff, on a field check, saw that the lights were different, that they could request the light be changed out.

Mr. Phinney (Cloke) moved to approve the alternate proposal of DCB #07-002-B, instructing Staff to check the quality of lighting once it was installed to

**confirm that it was consistent with the other lights in the shopping center.
[Unanimous consent]**

5. New Business

A. Parcel 52 & GG- Boat Central – DCB #07-005

Consideration of redevelopment project.

Ms. Miyamoto gave a brief overview of the project.

Mr. Thompson gave a PowerPoint overview of the project.

Board Comments

Mr. Phinney asked how many boats could be stored inside.

Mr. Thompson replied 346 to 367, depending on the size of the boat.

Mr. Phinney asked what function the Sheriffs' Boatwright facility performs.

Mr. Wisniewski replied the facility was used for the Sheriff's boat repairs and that the Lifeguards have also used it for Baywatch boat repair.

Mr. Phinney asked if the stated rate of seven to nine boats per hour was realistic.

Mr. Thompson replied yes.

Mr. Phinney asked if there was any potential for solar panels on the roof.

Mr. Thompson replied that the reason it was merely an option here was that this project didn't have much energy consumption to begin with, having very low lighting and no mechanical ventilation, air conditioning or heating. He stated the energy use was very small, but they would be happy to explore that possibility with the Department.

Mr. Phinney clarified that it wasn't a part of the current proposal.

Mr. Thompson replied it wasn't.

Mr. Phinney asked if the applicants were advocating removing 367 existing wet slips, or adding 367 boats to the Marina, just not in the water.

Mr. Thompson explained that the Marina was in dire need of additional slips, so the idea of the dry stack storage was being proposed to meet some of that demand.

Mr. Phinney asked Mr. Thompson if he was advocating removing existing wet slips.

Mr. Thompson replied no.

Mr. Phinney asked if the facility could run at night or if was only daytime hours for safety reasons.

Mr. Thompson responded that it has the function to run at night, but it would primarily run during the day.

Ms. Cloke, referring to page 4 of the submittal packet, asked what the two yellow lines to the left of the dry stack storage facility were.

Mr. Thompson replied that those were the two cranes that were on the adjacent property.

Ms. Cloke asked how many queuing spaces were in the boat queuing section.

Mr. Thompson replied that it was about 12 to 19 percent of the capacity, but the number was 40 boats normal capacity and 66 boats at peak capacity.

Ms. Cloke asked whom the boat washdown was for and if it was being relocated from the existing mast-up storage area.

Mr. Thompson replied that the boat washdown would be an added feature, and that there would still be a boat washdown at the launch ramp area, independent of theirs.

Ms. Cloke asked where people in the dry stack area could go to have their boats washed.

Mr. Thompson replied that they would wash the boats at a self-contained washdown area at the boat elevator.

Ms. Cloke asked how the applicant calculated the number of showers and bathroom facilities.

Mr. Meyers replied that they went with the Department of Boating and Waterways' recommendations, and then added one more for each gender.

Ms. Cloke asked if the restroom facilities were open for the customers of the dry stack storage or for other boaters as well.

Mr. Hogan replied that it was primarily just for the tenants at the site.

Ms. Miyamoto confirmed that practice was consistent with the other private marinas.

Mr. Wisniewski stated he understood that the bike lockers, lounge and the showers were amenities for those who would be using the dry stack facilities.

Ms. Cloke, referring to page 5 of submittal, asked if the building was designed so that the roof structure could accommodate solar panels.

Mr. Thompson replied that the structure had adequate weight for lightweight solar paneling if that was desired.

Ms. Cloke, referring to the panel samples, and asked what was white and what was clear in terms of the drawings presented.

Mr. Meyers replied that they were not proposing any of the clear panel samples presented; those were only so that the Board could see the actual material. He said that it was the exact material but not necessarily the final color.

Mr. Thompson said that they could have actual samples made if the Board so desired.

Ms. Cloke asked for more information about the materials being recyclable.

Mr. Meyers replied that the manufacturer stated that the material is 100% recyclable and is made out of 10% recyclable products.

Mr. Thompson replied that the steel was recyclable also.

Mr. Phinney asked where the panels were manufactured.

Mr. Meyers said Israel.

Ms. Cloke noted that the parking lot slopes down toward the water. She asked the applicant what storm water they intended to infiltrate and what storm water they intended to capture and how they would be differentiating.

Mr. Thompson stated that the natural grade was about seven feet across the site, and water would drain into the storm drain.

Ms. Cloke asked if the project would potentially store 367 boats that are currently in the Marina.

Mr. Wisniewski replied it would not add additional, as the Department would be vacating those storage spaces that are not contained on Parcel 77, because that area would be used for park expansion.

Ms. Cloke mentioned that the masts on the boats on the model did not appear to be to scale. She said it was important for the trees and masts to be to scale to properly represent the size of the building.

Public Comments

Mr. Weinman said it was curious that the proposed building extended over the water, since the LCP does not state that a building can. He didn't think that was good use of the water.

Mr. Weinman said he hoped that Dock 77 could remain where it was until this was built.

Mr. Dunlap stated that this facility was against the spirit of the Marina. He said he didn't like the wind shadow and would like to see a wind study. Mr. Dunlap stated that no one was going to go to a park that had a 70-foot tall building on the right and a dockyard on the left; there was no view of anything.

Mr. Schem stated the dry stack was a good thing for Marina del Rey and he had no objection to the proposed developer, but he strongly opposed the applicant's project because it was too big and it violated the County's own design guidelines set forth in the LCP.

Mr. Schem stated that this project would add to a dangerous environment in the already congested Basin H launch ramp area. He stated that the proposed structure would have a negative impact on the existing boat slips in the vicinity, as shadows would impact the boats at Parcel 52. He stated that the project does not provide affordable alternatives to wet slips as recommended in the Coastal Commission documents, and it would eliminate affordable alternatives for over 200 small boats. He felt the project was too big, too tall and too expensive to adequately address Marina del Rey boaters' needs.

Ms. Marino stated the project exemplified the need for a Master Plan review because of the interconnection issues between other parcels, other development zones and land use needs in the Marina. She stated that the project was not in compliance with the LCP, and several amendments would be required in order for it to proceed. She was concerned about safety issues resulting from the concentration of launch facilities in a single basin and the environmental and social issues relating to the boating experience for small boat owners in the Marina.

Ms. Marino stated that the Beaches and Harbors administration building, which was designated in the land use plan for this site, was currently homeless because the County was premature in inviting the RFP for this facility.

Ms. Marino said there was an LCP amendment that states that only a park or parking was allowed on an existing public lot, and said that the LCP required all privately developed parcels to include all parking for the parcel use on site. Additionally, she felt the project provided insufficient boat trailer parking and washdown facilities.

Ms. Marino felt that the Coast Guard needed to be consulted on whether this was the appropriate location to concentrate that much launch ramp traffic, since this was the only entry point for new boaters.

Ms. Cloke stated to the public that the Board accepts letters and emails for additional comments and input.

Mr. Anderson said the uniqueness of this facility was essentially the new technology, both from the electric crane itself and the environmental benefits of the crane. He stated this was unique to California, but its technology has been used very successfully in a lot of other places. He said the crane is practical when there is only a small footprint available and buildings are forced to be built vertically.

Mr. Levine felt it was extremely important to have dry stack storage facilities in the Marina. He stated that while he supported the project, he wanted to make sure that the question of the building-over-the-water precedence was aired fully and completely through the entitlement and design process.

Mr. Kern had concerns with the size of this structure, saying it would interfere with the aesthetics of the harbor and the wind patterns.

Mr. Yang asked if the item could be continued for an evening meeting so there could be more public input.

Ms. Andrus stated that although everyone was interested in dry stack storage, she had concerns about the bulk and scale of it. She stated the need to look at and honor the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Wong wanted clarification regarding the LCP amendment, whether that has to go first before the Board of Supervisors or simultaneously or afterwards. He asked if this process goes through the conceptual approval before everything else.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that this project was the result of an RFP process that was approved by the Board of Supervisors (BOS). He said the BOS knew once the Department negotiated and selected a developer and negotiated a term sheet and a lease option, all of which the Department has done, that they would then start the entitlement process.

Ms. Cloke asked when the RFP went out on this project.

Mr. Wisniewski replied there were two rounds of RFPs, but the first one had an alleged glitch and the BOS felt more comfortable going out a second time, and the subsequent RFP was in 2005.

Ms. Cloke asked if the applicant had thus been negotiating with the County on this for two years.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that the term sheet for the project had been reviewed and a lease option developed pursuant to BOS guidance in closed sessions. He said the actual lease option went before the Small Craft Harbor Commission yesterday, and that the BOS would now calendar it for consideration in public session. Mr. Wisniewski explained that everything being done with this applicant was consistent with what the BOS understood the project to be.

Ms. Cloke asked the timeframe from the first meeting with this applicant to the present.

Mr. Wisniewski replied March 2005 until today.

Ms. Cloke asked what kinds of parameters were handed to the applicant.

Mr. Wisniewski said the applicants were given the building envelope, which included the leasable land and water area of parcels 52 and GG, and allowed to come back with their own creativity. He said this applicant was selected twice out of a process in response to the RFP, as responding with the best proposal.

Ms. Cloke asked if the applicants were informed that the proposal was to build dry stack storage that extended out over the water.

Mr. Wisniewski stated he believed that the RFP left it up to the applicant.

Ms. Cloke stated that in the LCP, the Board worked very hard for the idea that there should be a continuous waterfront promenade. She stated anytime there was a new parcel to be redeveloped that it should be a continuous part of this waterfront promenade.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that because this site was adjacent to two commercial boat repair yards, there could not be a waterfront promenade for public safety reasons.

Mr. Cloke asked for an explanation as to why it wasn't safe and why the applicant couldn't create a separation that would create the required safety.

Mr. Wisniewski stated that with the daily activities that go on, a boat repair yard was not a safe place for people to be walking.

Ms. Cloke stated the LMU dock was right next to a boat repair place.

Mr. Wisniewski stated that in the interest of public safety this was not something that the Department was willing to do.

Mr. Phinney asked if Mr. Wieniewski was very clear that it was within the Board's privity to review this project even though it was inconsistent with the LCP.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that was correct.

Mr. Phinney stated he understood that the Board's very existence was to essentially enforce and interpret the LCP and to review projects for consistency. He said the likely outcome of this meeting was for the Board to find that the project was inconsistent with the LCP and that an amendment would be required, then to comment on the architectural and site issues that the Board normally addressed.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that the Board could review and approve this concept in any way they saw fit, assuming that County Counsel agreed that they were within the bounds of their ordinance authority.

Mr. Phinney asked Mr. Faughnan if he agreed.

Mr. Faughnan said he agreed.

Mr. Phinney was curious about the operational issues involved with queuing seven to nine boats an hour. He asked if the practical reality wouldn't be that it would take half a week to queue all of those boats at that rate.

Mr. Hogan replied that, in terms of usage of dry stacks, use is typically only 15 to 20 percent at any one given time.

Mr. Phinney said that was just because of the nature of people who own boats that choose to store them in that manner.

Mr. Hogan replied they were planning on usage of up to 30 percent. The ten boats in per hour were based upon a reservation system. He said they would have an idea of who was going to come and use the boat periodically. He stated that 90 percent of the time on weekdays and non busy weekends, it would be highly likely for a customer's boat to be in the water when they arrived. Mr. Hogan stated on busy weekends they had the capability to stage boats in the water up to a day or so prior to the customer arriving if that was necessary, and they had the capability of retrieving them in the same manner.

Mr. Phinney asked if the applicant had experience with this type of facility.

Mr. Hogan replied that while they have a number of marinas throughout the West Coast, and they had analyzed, looked at and spent extensive time at other operations, they did not have another one of these particular facilities.

Mr. Phinney asked why not just eliminate the exterior skin entirely, and have a skeletal structure showing the boats all the time, making it virtually transparent.

Mr. Thompson replied there would be a security issue with there being equipment out in the open. He also stated they did want to keep the people operating in there safe from the rain and birds.

Mr. Phinney stated that from a practical viewpoint, if he were sailing on the water, there would be birds on his boat, and with the hangar doors open there would be birds in this building.

Mr. Hogan replied that enclosing the building was very important to their customers, providing security and protection for the boats.

Mr. Phinney stated he was disappointed with the buildings because they lacked the sort of whimsy that the Board promotes in the Marina, and the public also mentioned that it looked industrial.

Mr. Phinney applauded the effort to make a sustainable building, but was disappointed to hear that the manufacturer of these panels was in Israel. He felt the applicant would be importing "Israel's waste" and using an incredible amount of energy to do it. He felt the applicant should rethink that concept.

Mr. Phinney suggested the applicant consider pulling the building back and having just the elevator and the crane assembly extend over the water. He felt it would set a dangerous precedent for the Board to allow a development over the water. He also stated that he had a hard time justifying the 120-boat gain versus what he saw as a negative impact of the building.

Ms. Cloke stated that the real problem she had was that the project was out of compliance with the LCP.

Ms. Cloke stated she was unsure how to separate her strong concerns, which she felt were really not the applicant's responsibility, but the County's. She thought that if the applicant had been given the mission to build a smaller version or a smaller building envelope that did not go over the water, that the applicant could have done a perfectly good job of it. She felt the applicant was just responding to the County's direction.

Mr. Wisniewski said he wanted to make sure the record showed that this project had gone through a very public process. He said the RFP had gone in front of the BOS,

who authorized the release of it. They then considered in open public session the recommendation of the Department, which included the over-the-water concept. He said he was sure that there were public comments made at that time. He said the project went from the Small Craft Harbor Commission to the BOS and the BOS approved it. He said the over-the-water concept came from the proposer, not the Department.

Ms. Cloke said that taking the waters of the United States and using them for development was not the right decision. She stated that this was water for boating and for people to enjoy looking at.

Ms. Cloke further stated she would not support any LCP amendment that included building out over the water. She said she thought this was a basic flaw in the site planning of the building and it needed to be rectified.

Ms. Cloke said the statements made about the sailing and the wind effects should be analyzed and studied.

Mr. Hogan replied that they have a wind study on record.

Ms. Cloke stated she had concerns about both the height and the environmental effect on the water and the wind and sun. She opposed using water for development, and stated it would be very difficult for the BOS or the County to say that the County has one set of rules for developers and another for the public.

Ms. Cloke agreed with the public that there needed to be a night meeting to address this item, and she said that the model accuracy needed to be verified.

Ms. Cloke felt that it would be helpful to better understand the question Mr. Phinney raised regarding the skin product, saying that at some point along the line the developers were going to need to provide real colors and real samples. She said that any transparent product would have to consider night lighting in the Marina, and she identified the need to get more education on the issue of the public promenade.

Ms. Cloke stated once the developer gets into the development of this project that their sustainability argument would be better served if they did not use palm trees, but more canopy trees.

Ms. Cloke stated that she does support the concept of the dry stack storage. She said she understood that there were different ways that people use their boats and she felt the County should be responsive to different kinds of boat users. She thought that, especially with the design of the small buildings, the developer could find a way to be more playful.

Ms. Cloke asked what effect the sun would have on the proposed plastic skin.

Mr. Meyers replied that it would have much less effect than anything else made in the world.

Ms. Cloke thought the developer could make the smaller buildings a lot more fun, and she thought that they needed to make the larger building a smaller building. She suggested the developer have an alternate proposal just in case the LCP amendments didn't go through.

Mr. Wong asked if the skin material would reflect the car headlights outside.

Mr. Thompson stated that the two large samples brought in were the most reflective version of the product made.

Mr. Wong stated that he would like some technical measurements from the manufacturer in terms of auto safety and daylight.

Ms. Cloke stated that because it was a new material they would all like to hear more about it.

Mr. Wong asked if the Board had any precedence in dealing with a building over the water.

Ms. Cloke stated that as long as she has been on the Board, the Board had never actually approved anything over the water.

Mr. Wong asked the applicant if they had any examples of the building product here or elsewhere.

Mr. Hogan replied that the product has been in existence for a number of years and was used at Loyola Marymount's Aquatics Center and a number of schools in Southern California.

Mr. Myers stated that the product was used at a new high school in South Central that was 95% exterior cladding made out of the material because of its durability.

Ms. Cloke stated that this should be continued to a night meeting date of the applicants' choice, and asked the applicant when they would like to come back.

Mr. Thompson asked for clarification of what they were being asked to return with.

Ms. Cloke stated she would like to see several different alternatives, but that it was up to the applicant. She said the Board would make suggestions on what they would like to see, and if they were on an approval track then the Board would say "we would like X done to this building and Y done to that building," but that it would be up to the applicant to make decisions about putting forward alternatives or not.

Ms. Cloke stated that she and Mr. Wisniewski would discuss why he thinks it's not a good idea to have a promenade and some of the other issues. She suggested that the applicant could put a promenade in one of the alternatives if they wanted to show how they would do it architecturally.

Ms. Cloke asked the applicant if they would like to come to the next month's evening meeting.

Mr. Hogan replied that the Board has given them things to consider and he was not sure they would be prepared for the next meeting and there were a number of things they would need to look at before they rescheduled.

Ms. Cloke (Phinney) moved to continue DCB# 07-005 to an evening meeting of the applicant's choice. [Unanimous consent]

6. Staff Reports

All reports were received and filed.

Ms. Miyamoto gave a brief overview of Item 6A.

Mr. Wisniewski gave a brief overview of Item 6B.

Board Comments

Ms. Cloke asked if the Del Rey Shores project was coming back for a final review.

Mr. Wisniewski replied it would be back for the architectural elements later on.

Ms. Cloke asked what the BOS did about the DCB motions.

Mr. Wisniewski replied he believed that item was re-calendared at Regional Planning (DRP). He asked Mr. Fricano if DRP was going to give notices to the Board so that they would have the BOS hearing date.

Mr. Fricano stated that to his knowledge the hearing was March 27, 2007 and he would like to refer Mr. Wisniewski's question to the BOS offices, as they were responsible for noticing interested parties.

Ms. Cloke asked if Regional Planning made any changes to the BOS motions regarding changing the scope of authority of the Board.

Mr. Fricano replied that he was not involved in that aspect and that it was handled through another section of the Department.

Ms. Cloke asked if any of the Staff had the answer to that question.

Mr. Faughnan replied that he was not aware of any changes that had been made by the Regional Planning Commission to the amendments from when they were presented to them, and those same amendments would be going to the Board of Supervisors and he believed the date would be March 27, 2007.

Ms. Cloke asked for an update of the Local Coastal Program Periodic Review.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that the Department had a meeting date with a staff member of Coastal Commission on March 29, 2007.

Ms. Cloke said that the new identity signage in the Marina looked very good.

Mr. Wisniewski thanked the Board for their patience in awaiting the signage

Ms. Cloke stated that Staff might want to look at the sign in front of the Visitor's Center, as some of the old back is still visible.

Mr. Sellers said that side would be resurfaced with the main blue color used on the front.

Ms. Cloke stated that the concerns regarding a Master Plan need to be addressed and she would like to see that on an agenda at a later date once Staff comes up with a proposal of what would be the appropriate way to approach the problem.

Mr. Wisniewski replied that the County would be happy to address it in a Staff Report.

Public Comments

Ms. Marino spoke about the LCP amendment for the Design Control Board's authority being held on March 27th, stating that they were the same amendments proposed on November 20th at Regional Planning. She said she hoped the Design Control Board would appear for the hearing. She asked about having a community member be involved in the Urban Design Committee. She spoke about having existing development on these parcels be included in the Staff Reports.

7. Comments from the Public

Ms. Andrus asked about a map of where the erosions were for the seawall repairs. She said a project status report on Phase I would be very helpful. She said that Doug Ring's developments have been pushed further and further. She spoke about the people who live at Bar Harbor getting a six-month notice, and asked if the County was shortening the six-month notice or if it would be July of next year.

Mr. Wisniewski replied he would be happy to have Staff answer that question, but it was not an item for consideration here.

Ms. Andrus stated that this was public comment.

Ms. Cloke explained to Ms. Andrus that the Design Control Board doesn't get into the maintenance of the seawall, but Mr. Wisniewski was offering to have Staff try to answer her questions.

Mr. Wisniewski stated there was a Master Plan and that they have accessed areas of the seawall, that it's been through the Board and the contract has been awarded.

Ms. Walker spoke about having a Master Plan, and how the Marina needs upgrading and how the lessees throughout the years should have kept up their properties. She felt the County should have been supervising the lessees to make sure they kept up the properties. She thanked the DCB for all their help in making the Marina the kind of marina it should be.

Ms. Marino spoke about how the developers have brought some extremely creative professional as well as thoughtful solutions to the RFP that the County has put forth. She disagreed that the County had put RFP proposals out that were not in conformance with the LCP. She stated that the LCP was supposed to be the guiding document for the Marina.

Public comments closed

8. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kimberly Monroe
Secretary for the Design Control Board